



LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Case

Shelf

Book

BR 115 .C5 V47 1850
V ericour, L. Raymond de d.
1879.

Historical analysis of
Christian civilisation

HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

OF

CHRISTIAN CIVILISATION.

BY

L. R. DE VERICOUR,

AUTHOR OF "MILTON AND EPIC POETRY," "MODERN FRENCH LITERATURE,"
"EDUCATIONAL REPORTS," ETC., ETC.

LONDON:

JOHN CHAPMAN, 142, STRAND.

M.DCCC.L.

TO

M. GUIZOT,

LATE PRIME MINISTER OF FRANCE,

This Work

IS DEDICATED

AS A VERY SINCERE THOUGH FEEBLE TESTIMONY

OF RESPECT AND ADMIRATION,

AND OF GRATITUDE FOR KIND FAVOURS RECEIVED,

BY

THE AUTHOR.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

Definition of History.—Importance of Historical Studies.—The Law of Progress.—Characteristics of Nations.—The End of Humanity.—Principles of Christianity.—Christian Tendencies of the Age.—Scepticism and Fanaticism.—Object of the present Work.—Unity and Superiority of the Christian Civilisation.—Phases of the Christian Civilisation.—*First Period*.—Corruption and Decline of the Roman Empire.—Propagation of the Christian Doctrine.—Its Contrast with the older Laws.—Authenticity of the Primitive Sources of the History of Christianity.—Persecutions of the Propagators of Christianity and of the Early Christians.—Triumph of Christianity.—Controversies fatal to the Progress of Christianity.—The Bishop of Rome.—The First Councils.—Moral Ascendancy of the Christians.—Early Christian Literature.—Gnosticism.—Origen.—Heresies.—Practical Principles of St. Paul 1—21

CHAPTER II.

First Period continued.—The Emperor Constantine.—His Character.—His Institutions.—State of Christianity in his Time.—His Death (337).—His Sons.—Julian, Emperor (361).—Jovian (363).—Valentinian I. and II.—Gratian.—Theodosius the Great.—His Character and Death (395).—The Roman Court.—State of the Empire.—The Colonies.—State of the Roman Armies.—The Germanic Hordes.—Their Situation in Northern Europe.—Invasions of the Huns.—Of the Goths.—Alaric.—Victories of Stilicho.—His Death.—Sack of Rome by Alaric (410).—Kingdom

of the Visigoths in Spain.—The Vandals.—Genseric.—Destruction of Carthage.—The Huns.—Attila.—Pillage of Rome by Genseric (455).—Nullity of the Roman Emperors of the West.—Extinction of the Empire of the West (476).—Influence of the Church.—Monastic Communities.—The Fathers of the Church.—The Ecclesiastical Organisation.—The Pontiffs.—Christian Literature of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries.—Arianism.—Its Triumph and Condemnation.—Schism of the Donatists.—Pelagius.—Heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches.—Progress of Christianity.—First Period concluded 22—48

CHAPTER III.

Second Period.—The Empire of the East.—Causes of its Weakness.—The Emperors of the East, from Arcadius to Justinian (408-527).—Justinian.—Military Expeditions of his Reign, against the Vandals, the Persians, the Avars, the Goths, the Bulgarians.—The Successors of Justinian.—The Dynasty of Heraclius, to 718.—That of Leo the Iconoclast, to 802.—That of Michael I., to 867.—That of Basil the Macedonian, to 1057.—The Churches of the East and the West.—Theological Dissensions.—Influence of the Laws.—Italy, an instance of it.—Reformation of the Roman Jurisprudence.—The Code.—The Pandects.—The Byzantine Literature.—Architecture.—The Barbarian Kingdoms.—The Ostrogoths.—The Lombards.—The Visigoths.—The Burgundians.—The Franks.—Clovis.—The Controversy on the Origin of France.—Death of Clovis (511).—Clotaire (558).—France reunited under Clotaire II. (613).—The Mayors of the Palace.—Charles Martel.—Laws of the Barbarians.—Their Influence.—M. Guizot.—Administration of the Barbarians.—The Judicial Duel.—The Ordeals.—Their Origin.—State of Europe. 49—80

CHAPTER IV.

Second Period continued.—The Arabs.—Mohammed.—The Koran.—Mohammed's Successors.—The Ommeiyades.—The Abbassides.—The Mohammedan Civilisation contrasted with the Christian.—France.—The Carolingians.—Charles Martel.—His Death (741).—Pepin the Short, King (752).—His Death (768).—Charlemagne.—His Military Expeditions.—Crowned at Rome (800).—His Administrative Institutions.—His Death (814).—Partition of the Carolingian Empire.—Death of Louis the Debonair (840).—War between Lothaire and his Brothers.—Disastrous State of the Christian Nations.—Charles the Bald, Emperor (843).—His Death (877).—Louis the Stammerer.—Charles the Fat, Emperor

(884).—Dissolution of the Carolingian Empire.—Formation of the Kingdoms of Germany, Italy, Burgundy, Navarre, Lorraine, and France.—Eudes.—Charles the Simple, King (898).—His Death (929).—Raoul.—Louis d'Outremer.—Hugh Capet, King of France (987).—Britain.—Conquest of the Saxons.—The Hephtharchy.—Egbert.—Alfred.—His Exploits, Virtues, and Administration.—Invasion of the Danes.—Canute, King of all England (1017).—Expulsion of the Danes.—Edward the Confessor.—Harold.—Battle of Hastings (1066).—Norman Influence.—Influence of Pontifical Rome.—Changes in the Church, Literature, and Fine Arts.—Second Period in the Christian Civilisation concluded.—Its Character 81—111

CHAPTER V.

Third Period of the History of Europe and Christian Civilisation.—The Middle Ages.—Character of that Period.—Feudalism.—The Fiefs and their Privileges.—State of the Church of Rome.—Her Corruption.—Hildebrand.—His Efforts —Elected Pope in 1073.—His Reforms.—Struggle between Papacy and Henry IV. of Germany.—Subsequent Zeal of the Popes.—Alexander III.—Innocent III.—France.—Activity of the French Nation.—State of the North and South contrasted.—Successors of Hugh Capet.—Louis VI. (1108).—The Municipalities.—Their Revolutions.—Louis VII. (1137).—Philip Augustus (1180).—Greatness of his Reign.—The Albigenian War.—Louis VIII. (1223-1226).—Regency of Blanche of Castille.—Saint Louis (1231).—His Virtues and lofty Faculties.—Judiciary and Social Progress.—England.—Consequences of the Norman Conquest.—Successors of William the Conqueror.—William II. (1087).—Henry I. (1100).—Stephen (1135).—Henry II. (1154).—Richard Cœur de Lion (1189).—John (1199).—The Magna Charta (1215).—Henry III. (1216).—Commencement of the English Parliament.—Edward I. (1272).—Character of the English Constitution.—Importance of the Study of Laws.—Observation of Montesquieu on the English Constitution 112—138

CHAPTER VI.

Third Period continued.—Importance of Method in the Study of History.—Germany.—Character of her History.—Conrad of Franconia (911).—Henry I. (919).—Otho I. (936).—Greatness of his Reign.—Otho II. (973).—Otho III. (983).—Henry II. (1002).—Conrad II. (1024).—Henry III. (1039).—Henry IV. (1056).—State of Lombardy.—Its Municipal Organisation.—

State of Southern Italy.—Conquests of the Normans.—Quarrel of Henry IV. with Gregory VII.—Wars in Germany.—Henry V. (1106).—Lothair II. (1125).—Conrad III., of Hohenstauffen (1137).—Origin of the Guelfs and Ghibellins.—Frederic I., Barbarossa (1152).—His Wars in Germany and Lombardy.—Henry VI. (1190).—Philip (1198).—Otho IV. (1208).—Frederic II. (1212).—His War with the Pope and the Guelfs.—His Death (1250).—Interregnum.—Constitutions of Italy and Germany.—The Crusades.—Object and Consequences of the Crusades.—Tendencies of the Church.—St. Bernard.—The Mendicant Orders.—Ecclesiastical Legislation.—Changes in Feudalism.—Chivalry.—Its Origin.—Commerce.—Architecture.—Its Splendour during the Middle Ages.—The Vernacular Literature of Italy, France, and Germany.—The Universities.—Scholasticism.—Abelard.—Attacks on the Church and Clergy.—Arnold of Brescia.—The Vaudois.—Study of the Roman Law.—Chronicles.—Science.—Roger Bacon.—Character of this Epoch.

139—172

CHAPTER VII.

Third Period continued.—Character of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.—State of Papacy.—Boniface VIII. (1294).—Decline of the Pontifical Influence.—Corruption of the Higher Clergy.—Schism.—Three Popes in 1409.—Council of Constance (1414).—John Huss and Jerome of Prague burnt.—Council of Basle (1431).—Savonarola.—France.—Philip the Fair (1285).—The States-General.—The Parliaments.—Reigns of Philip the Fair's Three Sons.—Philip of Valois (1328).—John (1350).—Miserable State of France.—The Jacquerie.—Charles V. (1364).—Charles VI. (1380).—Victory and Oppression of the Nobles.—Civil War.—Treaty of Troyes (1420).—Charles VII. (1424).—Joan of Arc.—Louis XI. (1461).—England.—Character of Edward I. (1272).—Progress of the Judiciary Institutions.—Wars.—Edward II. (1307).—Edward III. (1327).—Richard II. (1377).—The House of Lancaster.—The House of York.—Henry VII., Tudor (1485).—Henry VIII. (1509).—Germany.—Accession of Rodolf of Hapsburg (1273).—Adolf.—Albert I.—Henry VII. of Luxemburg (1308).—Lewis of Bavaria (1318).—Charles IV. (1347).—The Golden Bull.—Wenceslas (1378).—Robert (1400).—Sigismund (1410).—Albert II. (1438).—Frederic III. (1440).—Maximilian (1493).—The Hanseatic League.—Switzerland.—Italy.—Venice.—Genoa.—Pisa.—Lombardy.—Florence.—Rome.—Naples.—Remarkable Epochs.—Great Political Movements in Europe during the Fourteenth Century . 173—227

CHAPTER VIII.

Third Period continued.—Spain.—The Spaniards.—The Goths subdued by the Arabs.—Pelagus.—Khalifate of Cordova.—Civil Wars among the Arabs.—Formation of the Spanish States.—Partitions.—Navarre.—Arragon.—Castille.—Portugal.—Constitution of Spain.—The Fueros.—The Nobility.—The Clergy.—The Cortes.—The People.—The Spanish Language and Literature.—Arabic Influence in Spain.—Scandinavia.—Conversion of Scandinavia.—Barbarism of Sweden and Norway.—More advanced State of Denmark.—Victories of the Danes.—Union of Calmar (1397).—Subjection of Sweden.—Gustavus Wasa.—Scandinavian Constitutions.—Languages and Literature.—Iceland.—The Sagas.—Poland.—The Race of Piast.—Influence of Christianity.—Wars of Poland.—Her Constitution.—Casimir the Great.—His Death (1370).—The Jagellons.—Casimir of Lithuania (1447).—His Civil Institutions.—Character of the Polish Monarchy.—Extinction of Poland.—Russia.—Her Origin.—Novogorod.—Ruric (850).—Wladimir the Great (980).—Russia converted to the Greek Church.—Russia under the Mongolian Yoke from 1224 to 1477.—Ivan the Terrible commences the System of Russian Absolutism.—Accession of the House of Romanow (1613).—Hungary.—The Race of Arpad.—St. Stephen, the Hero Legislator (996).—Magyars embrace Christianity.—Progress of Hungary.—Finally annexed to Austria, in 1527.—Constantinople.—Extinction of the Greek Empire.—Prospects of Christianity in the East.—Third Period concluded.

228—266

CHAPTER IX.

Fourth Period in the History of Europe and of Christian Civilisation.—Character of Modern History.—The Sixteenth Century.—Revival of Letters.—Poggio.—Invention of Printing.—Results of the Classical Pursuits.—Architecture.—Painting.—Music.—Literary and Scientific Revolutions.—Copernicus.—Galileo.—Discoveries of the Portuguese.—Progress of Commerce.—Columbus.—Conquests and Atrocities of the Spaniards.—Settlements of the French, Dutch, and English.—State of Europe.—Spain.—Unity of Spain.—Queen Isabella.—Accession of Charles.—Italy.—France.—Louis XII. (1498).—Venice.—Francis I. (1515).—Charles V., King of Spain, elected Emperor of Germany (1519).—War.—Battle of Pavia (1525).—War in Italy.—Progress of the Turks.—Renewal of the War.—Peace of Crespy (1544).—Henry II. of France (1547).—Philip II. of Spain

(1556).—War.—Peace of Cateau Cambresis (1559).—Royal Privileges in France.—Polity of Charles V. and Philip II. of Spain.—Results of the Reign of Charles V.—State of the Church.—Martin Luther.—His Attacks on the Pope and Clergy.—Diet of Worms (1521).—Influence of Luther.—His Separation from other Reformers.—The Anabaptists.—Thomas Munzer (1533).—The Protestants and Huguenots.—Diets of Augsburg and Worms.—Hostilities between Catholics and Protestants.—Victories of Charles V.—His Despotism.—Peace of Augsburg (1555).—Death and Character of Luther.—General Advantages of the Reformation characterised by M. Guizot.—Calvin and Calvinism.—Council of Trent (1545).—The Jesuits.—General Reformation in the Roman Catholic Church 267—307

CHAPTER X.

Fourth Period continued.—England.—State of the nation under Henry VIII.—The Reformation introduced.—Edward VI. (1547).—Mary.—Elizabeth (1558).—Establishment of the Church of England.—Government of Elizabeth.—Relations with Scotland.—Mary, Queen of Scots.—James I. (1603).—Spain.—Philip II.—State of Spain.—War against the Turks.—The Netherlands.—Revolt of the Southern Provinces.—They form themselves into Federal States.—Conquest of Portugal (1580).—Death of Philip II. (1598).—France.—Religious dissensions.—Conspiracy of Amboise.—Commencement of the Civil War (1562).—Peace of Longjumeau (1568).—Of St. Germain (1570).—Massacre of St. Bartholomew (1572).—Henry III. (1574).—Treaty of 1576.—The Holy League.—Its Democratic Spirit.—Henry of Guise.—Murder of Henry III. (1589).—Henry IV., of Bourbon, King of France (1593).—His Government.—Assassinated in 1610.—Louis XIII.—Richelieu.—His Character and Policy.—Fall of La Rochelle.—Death of Richelieu and Louis XIII. (1642).—Regency.—The Fronde.—Germany.—Successors of Charles V.: Ferdinand I., Maximilian II., and Rodolf II.—The Latter's Intolerance, and Death (1612).—Mathias, Emperor.—Religious Dissensions in Bohemia.—Ferdinand I., Emperor (1619).—The Thirty Years' War.—The Palatine Period (1619-1623).—Danish Period (1625-1629).—Swedish Period (1630-1635).—French Period (1635-1648).—Ferdinand III. (1637).—The Peace of Westphalia.—Character of this Epoch.—Condition of the different Classes of Society.

308—349

CHAPTER XI.

Fourth Period continued.—France.—Administration of Mazarin.—Louis XIV.—Character of his Reign.—Regency of the Duke of Orleans.—Corruption of Society.—External Policy of France.—Financial System of Law.—Louis XV.—His Ministers.—War of the Succession of Austria (1742-1748).—Scepticism.—Corruption.—Beaumarchais.—State of France.—Accession of Louis XVI. (1774).—His Character and Difficulties.—Turgot.—Necker.—States-General of 1789.—England.—Accession of Charles I. (1625).—Struggle between the King and Parliaments.—No Parliament from 1630 to 1638.—Hampden.—The King gives way, but too late.—Civil War.—Victories of Cromwell.—His Ascendancy.—Trial and Execution of Charles I. (1649).—Character of the Revolution.—Government of Cromwell.—His Death (1658).—Charles II. (1660).—James II. (1685).—Revolution of 1688.—William III. and Mary.—Progress of England.—Queen Anne (1702).—George I. (1714).—Walpole and Chatham.—Peace of Paris (1763).—American Insurrection (1773).—Progress of the English Constitution under Charles II., and after 1688.—The Netherlands.—Internal Dissensions.—The Armenians and Gomarists.—Barneveld (1619).—Prosperity of the Netherlands.—William of Orange.—Vicissitudes of Holland.—Germany.—Frederic III. (1637).—Leopold I. (1658).—Wars with France and Turkey.—Joseph I. (1705).—Charles VI. (1711).—War of Succession.—Prussia.—Maria Theresa.—Frederic II. of Prussia.—The Seven Years' War.—Joseph II. (1765).—Leopold II. (1790).—Spain, Italy, and Portugal 350—391

CHAPTER XII.

Fourth Period continued.—Scandinavia.—Succession of Christian II. in Denmark.—Peace of Stettin (1570).—State and Decline of Denmark.—Sweden.—Successors of Gustavus Wasa.—Gustavus Adolphus (1611).—Charles XII. (1697).—Wars and Decline of Sweden.—Constitutions of Sweden and Norway.—Poland.—Succession of the Jagellons.—Wars.—Internal Dissensions.—Influence of Russia.—First Partition of Poland (1772); the Second (1793).—Poland extinct (1795).—Russia.—Accession of the House of Romanow (1613).—State of Russia.—Peter the Great.—Catharine II.—Russian Policy.—Sketches of the Intellectual, Moral, and Social History of Europe since the Sixteenth Century.—Intellectual Developments.—Lord Bacon.—Descartes.—Newton.—Leibnitz.—Pascal.—Natural Philosophy.—Chemistry.—Natural History.—Botany.—Medicine.—Architecture.—

Painting.—Music.—Literature.—Formation of the Modern Languages and Literatures.—Literature of England.—Of France.—Of Germany and Spain.—Decline of the Political Influence of the Church of Rome.—Character of the Religious Assemblies and Institutions.—Surpassing Activity of the Church of Rome.—Dissensions.—The Jansenists.—Triumph and Decline of the Jesuits.—Present State of the Church of Rome and of Protestantism.—Progress of the Material Interests and of Commerce.—Characters of France, England, and Russia.—Germany.—Spain.—Italy.—Switzerland.—Holland.—Material State of the Nations of Europe.—Discoveries.—Innovations.—General Progress.—The Fourth Period in the History of European Civilization, concluded.—Fifth Period, commencing with the French Revolution of 1789.—Its Character and Consequences.—Napoleon.—Present State of Europe.—Prospects of Christian Civilisation.—Nature of Man.—Final Reign of Truth and of Christian Justice.

392—438

APPENDIX	439—468
Chronological Tables	469—480
Historical Library, or Catalogue of Historical Works :	481—502

EPITOME

OF THE

HISTORY OF EUROPE.

CHAPTER I.

Definition of History.—Importance of Historical Studies.—The Law of Progress.—Characteristics of Nations.—The End of Humanity.—Principles of Christianity.—Christian Tendencies of the Age.—Scepticism and Fanaticism.—Object of the present Work.—Unity and Superiority of the Christian Civilisation.—Phases of the Christian Civilisation.—*First Period*.—Corruption and Decline of the Roman Empire.—Propagation of the Christian Doctrine.—Its Contrast with the older Laws.—Authenticity of the Primitive Sources of the History of Christianity.—Persecutions of the Propagators of Christianity and of the Early Christians.—Triumph of Christianity.—Controversies fatal to the Progress of Christianity.—The Bishop of Rome.—The First Councils.—Moral Ascendancy of the Christians.—Early Christian Literature.—Gnosticism.—Origen.—Heresies.—Practical Principles of St. Paul.

HISTORY relates the multitude of actions and phases by which man manifests his passage upon earth; they seem, apparently, to have neither regularity nor stability, but a providential law presides over them. It is the law of progress. The true, immortal idea of progress is the offspring of Christianity. It is the consequence of Christian tuition, the spirit of which is, that we are all children of the same Father,—that we are all members of the same community,—that the day will come when there will be but one flock, one pastor,—when the human races will form, not only a unity, but a society. God manifests himself to man through reason and conscience; but it is by

history that the supreme government of the Deity is revealed and made manifest to humanity. History, says Schiller, is the tribunal of the world, it is indeed the great earthly judge, hailing and analysing the merits which should be recompensed and held as a standard for the future, and denouncing the crimes that must be eternally reprobated. History, by relating the progress of the past, hastens and regulates the future movements of the human mind ; and the study of that progress which is the law of all, is the study of the advance of principles, affections, and intellectual powers, and marks out the mode in which individuals and nations shall unfold themselves, so that they may grow up what God designs them to be.

Jesus Christ is the great central luminary in history. By his divine revelation he has marked out the path that must be followed by humanity ; but, after him, the field he has opened must be cleared ; a huge, gigantic task—far from being terminated, in some cases only just commenced. Mountains of prejudice and ignorance remain yet to be removed, the intellect and the heart require yet to be drained for a purer growth of Christian morality ; history has to investigate the facts, causes, and ideas of each epoch, and assign to the latter their just import and effects, for they constitute the vital principle,—the eternal life-blood of humanity, of which the material and tumultuous events and revolutions are merely the secondary and transient results. Assuredly, in opening history, in unfolding the records of the past, the men of genius who hold the loftiest position in the loftiest domain of that science could repeat the remarkable words that Moses has addressed to his people :—“ See, I have set before thee this day, life and good, and death and evil. It is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it ? Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear and do it ? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayst do it.”

The history of humanity, therefore, is explained by the law

of progress, which throws a vivid light on its records of past actions and movements. Progress explains the phases of history. They are the result of the nature of man, individually speaking, of the functions of societies, and of the succession assigned to the acts of humanity itself. The conviction of the progressive working of humanity can alone meet the restless yearnings which characterise the modern nations and the ardent wishes of the masses for better days. And by the study of history, above all, the conviction can be acquired that all the principal events tend to the same end,—universal civilisation, and the continuous advancement towards perfection.

The functions of man are of a social nature ; they merge in the whole species. Man isolated would be a nullity. Societies alone act in the world. Moreover, the normal state of every human society exhibits the principal element of the progress of humanity. Societies alone, therefore, possess a power of action in the world ; and among the nations which have had a share in the work of progress accomplished hitherto, each has marked its influence by a characteristic feature ;—each has had a special function in the general advance.

Those fundamental principles and characteristics of nations, derived from the tendencies and acts of each, and without which a nation could not exist, have a unity, and an object, which may conveniently be called the end of activity. A common end in the movement and advancement of societies, is the essential condition of their existence. Without it, the social state becomes impossible. The nature of man demands activity ; his life is a perpetual activity, and men could not be united, and evince such deeply-rooted attraction and sympathy, if there was not a common end to be obtained. The end of humanity cannot emanate from human will. Its basis must be far more solid. It must be a duty ordained by God, and it is called morality. Morality is the great law that regulates all human relations. It lays down to men the means and end of perfection. Morality is the supreme law of societies, of individuals, and of humanity. But religion alone

can create and indicate the common end of human activity, which thus becomes synonymous with religious morality.

The study of the moral, religious and political modification of nations unravels the various ends which they have hitherto attained. The world owes to Christianity the pre-eminence of a new morality and of sublime principles unknown before. Christianity has sown the ideas which have been, during eighteen centuries, at once the instrument and the moving power of human activity ; liberty to the enthralled,—equality to all,—brotherhood of nations,—human unity. It will and must level all obstacles. Its end is to spiritualise man, to animate all races, and to animate them alike ; to engender, through an universal sympathy, the unity of mankind. Christianity has been taught and propagated for ages ; its principles of political liberty, of religious equality, and of national fraternity, are daily growing more and more rooted in all hearts. Nature yields to its divine laws. Its end and object, we repeat it, are to bring the whole world under one common law, to unite by one common duty of fraternity, by feelings of universal sympathy, the most divergent and the most remote nations. Now, therefore, of necessity, the morality of Jesus Christ has to penetrate into all our laws and institutions ; all nations must replace by it, and by it alone, the vitiated part of an older, and grosser, and a more partial system. The work of regeneration must be continued and terminated. The will of God must be done on earth as it is in heaven.

But, on the other hand, if the principles of Christianity are daily gaining ground among the most civilised nations, they have to struggle with a deeply-rooted, sensuous egotism, and with indifference. Moreover, the warmest advocates of Christianity often outstep the boundaries of moderation as well as of Christian truth, and engender many fatal consequences. Thus, despite the secret working of Christianity, we are in a deplorable state of transition. We behold fanaticism on one side, and much hypocrisy and weakness on the other. Many energetic and pure souls, also, truly depressed by all that

passes round them, plunge in the other extreme. Provoked by the insolence of fanaticism, by their threats of triumph, they, in despair, oppose bold defiance and absolute negation.

But those who take refuge in scepticism forget that the principles of materialism have often kept human thought in thralldom, that they have often given powerful instruments to despotism, and that they reduce humanity to a state of mere animal mechanism. We all possess in our sphere, in the progress of our spiritual being, the expression of that legitimate and most sacred right of human reason, viz., the longing and the right of the human soul to outstep the limits of our visible world, and to regenerate and refresh itself in the ideal of eternity; for it is through that yearning only that we can attain the elevation of sentiments and of feelings which give to human life its real value, its Christian dignity, the love of virtue, of the beautiful, and the love of our fellow-creatures. Thus only can we obtain faith in the invisible and the ideal, and be cheered by that sacred hope which flashes in the dark prospects of the grave with streams of that vivifying light of an immortal futurity.

Doubtless many proclaim as chimerical these lofty aspirations of the mind: they scorn the sublime presentiments of the heart; they would confine man to the limited horizon of the visible world; and those fatal principles have acquired of late a renovated popularity and freshness by the successful publication of a work written with great vigour.* But, believe me, those know but little the profound cravings of our spiritual nature, the power of reason, the dignity and value of humanity, who thus attack our very rights to freedom of thought; they crush all those unfathomable bursts and aspirations of our soul; indeed, they degrade the human mind, and almost reduce the sublime principles of Christianity to a dead letter.

We believe that the study of Christian Europe and Christian civilisation must prove, in our present state of society,

* The Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation.

and with the rising generation, a most solemn, a most moral thing. Our object is to awake the attention of the public to the importance of that study. We will endeavour to trace their pre-eminent features, their broad outlines, with brevity, leaving the details to special histories, which will be referred to ; but saying enough, however, to mark the slow and majestic march of its progress. Such a study proves the progressive amelioration of all ; it engenders resignation in bitter days, courage in the struggles, confidence in futurity, a greater degree of sympathy, and a belief in the final reign of Christian justice. Truly enough, many are plunged in luxurious selfishness, others suffer and rise in threatening clamour,—yet, if the attention of the present generation is drawn to the study of Christian civilisation, and to the working of Christian principles, all will learn to do their duties, to do their best, according to their means ; some will understand that they must bear with courage and resignation their momentary weight, and that they will be rewarded in a better world ; others will see that, if the spirit of Christ has not yet penetrated into our laws, institutions and manners,—that if we still behold round us, hideously triumphant, the dark foes of our spiritual progress and perfection,—it is nevertheless manifest, and working in the depths of human nature ;—that the spirit of Christ is the general inspiration of enlightened humanity, and that its influence is felt from one end of the globe to the other. In truth, they will also behold it in the aspiration of pure souls—of noble hearts. Indeed, it dwells in the conscience of all, who know, who feel, that the present state of things, being a state of transition, cannot be of long duration, and that the passions so hostile to the moral progress of humanity must gradually be transformed by the influence of Christianity ; again, and finally, all will learn by the study of the practical application of Christian principles, that our duty as Christians is to co-operate to effect the moral progress and perfection of humanity, and that our most efficacious and simple mode of doing this, is, for each to strain after his own improvement and perfection.

If our object were to search the remotest origin of civilisation, our studies would be directed towards the East, where the greatest dramas of the most ancient history have taken place. But Greece and Rome turned the destiny of human societies towards the West ; they fixed their progressive movement on that soil, which has remained the great centre of all subsequent progress and development. The history of Christian civilisation is, therefore, a European history. With the exception of the great nation celebrated for the religious reformation of Mohammed, all the races of the East offer endless revolutions, ever identical in their principles and results, and void of historical interest, whilst the history of Christian civilisation presents an admirable unity in its progress. The phases through which our Christian doctrine has advanced in the convictions, ideas, fine arts, and manners, present also a natural and precise method in the progress and transformation of societies ; and the great principle of those progressive changes is ever visible—ever ostensible in its purity. But along with that perfect moral unity comes the confusion of details and the division of material facts.

They present great difficulties for a general history, whatever may be the method adopted. If a continuous historical unity of each nationality without interruption is offered, then the general connecting link and influence of facts escape the student ; he merely sees a collection of special histories losing the trace of the great main fact, viz., the progress of humanity itself, being exposed moreover to numerous repetitions. If, on the other hand, the chronological method is adopted, it engenders endless subdivisions ; the history of each nation is cut up, and the student is incessantly carried from one subject to another. The nature and object of the present work, however, obliges us to adhere to the latter method, and we have remedied, as much as possible, the necessity of cutting up the special histories of nations by chronological tables, and also by referring to special histories, and to those works in which the material history, and the history of details, is abundantly treated.

The Christian civilisation has gone through four great phases, and has entered the fifth with the French Revolution;—they are the leading feature, we may say—the points of departure of the history of Christianity. But in thus dividing Christian civilisation in four periods as far as the French Revolution which commences the fifth, it is naturally understood that each of them presents very distinct chronological and accidental subdivisions.

The first period comprises the time that separates the life and death of Jesus Christ, to the fall of the empire of the West. That period belongs entirely to Roman history. We first behold in it the propagation of the Christian faith among the old, decayed societies; afterwards, the struggles and triumph of Christianity, and its introduction in the civil and political organisations. In the mean time the church of Christ has also organised itself, established its chief dogmas, developed its doctrine; in short, the old Pagan religion is conquered.

As the second period commences with the extinction of the Roman empire of the West, we are naturally led to the East, where the Roman empire and Roman manners have been transferred; but this empire of the East becomes a lifeless transition, as the invasions of the barbarians transform the whole of western Europe, where new nations form themselves under the auspices of Christianity, France being then the most pre-eminent among all. During a short time, however, the Christian nations were threatened with annihilation. The Mohammedan civilisation spread with the rapidity of lightning, but was at last conquered and overpowered by France. Afterwards, Charlemagne created the first real elements of Christian organisation; he modified the civil and religious legislation, established the ecclesiastical constitution and the unity of the spiritual authority.

The third period comprises those ages during which the Christian nations are characterised for the first time by that new vivifying spirit, offspring of Christianity, and in which they were neither Romans nor barbarians, nor yet presenting any of

the mature features of modern societies, and is therefore properly called the Middle Ages. This period is naturally divided in two parts, during the first of which the Christian nations advance rapidly towards the highest spiritual faith; it is the time of the Crusades—of chivalry—of what is called Gothic architecture—of the old universities—of the revolutions in the communities; but, during the second part of this third period—at the commencement of the fourteenth century—all the supreme authorities, royalty and papacy, decline, whilst the nationalities firmly establish themselves, and, in the mean time, new and younger nations emerge from obscurity in various parts of Europe.

The fourth period rises with the sixteenth century. It is the time of the revival,—of the *Renaissance*. A new blood seems to circulate in the veins of all the Christian nations. Hitherto the progress of humanity has worked *à priori*; it has come from above, it has been the result of the intelligence and efforts of the higher powers and authorities. With the sixteenth century commence the new inventions,—the various murmurs of revolutions,—the dawn of a public opinion; in short, the silent subterranean working of the masses, and of all that has engendered the marvellous changes of our age. That period is marked from its very cradle by great events which seem to separate the Middle Ages from the modern times; they are—the discovery of America, of the art of printing; the return towards the literature of antiquity, the struggles of the European nations for the possession of Italy, and the rivalry between the house of Austria and that of France: such were the preludes of the mighty progress of the modern Christian civilisation.

First Period.—The Roman empire was rapidly decaying; all the vices of the East and of Greece were combined with the innate barbarism of the primitive Romans. In vain Cæsar and Augustus endeavoured to check the flood of immoralities; to these was joined an inextinguishable thirst for cruel and sanguinary amusements,—so indicative of the barbarism of society. The bloody combat of animals—the mortal struggle

of gladiators, had extended to an awful degree. Feasts for the people, in which hundreds of ferocious animals would tear each other, and thousands of slaves perished daily, often lasted whole months. Sometimes 20,000 men were engaged in battles in the circus, and half of them destined to be slaughtered.

Besides immorality, the Roman society was decaying through slavery and the outrageous inequality of conditions. The rich displayed a fabulous splendour; their palaces were more like luxurious cities; their lands and income were such as to allow them to undertake, at their own expense, the building of temples and circus, the digging of immense canals, the construction of public roads. The middle class had totally disappeared. The great mass of the population was composed of slaves. At all times, immense speculations had been made upon human beings. Atticus, Cicero's friend, had slaves taught and trained, to sell them afterwards at a higher price. During the empire, many Roman citizens possessed from ten to twenty thousand slaves. They met with no pity. Those who were employed in rural labours were scarcely fed, and plunged during the night in fetid dungeons, chained to each other;—they were decimated by famine, sufferings, and by the combat of the circus; yet they formed about three-fourths of the whole population.

The empire could not fail to be soon depopulated. The foreign and civil wars, the fiscal oppression, helped in the worst of destruction; and soon, no hands were found to cultivate the lands. The most productive soils became a desert. Thus, the antique civilisation was drawing to a close. All had perished—creeds, manners, institutions, science, literature. A return to primitive manners, indeed to chaos, seemed imminent. But it was not to be so. The world had to fulfil another destination. Christianity came to sow the seeds of a new life, and a new history commences with the propagation of the Holy Scriptures.

It is well known that Jesus Christ was born about four years before the commencement of the vulgar era; but this

error does not affect the chronology of history, and we may therefore adopt it without fear, since it is universally acknowledged—and we may state that our Saviour was born in the thirty-first year of the reign of the Emperor Augustus. We will not relate the first origin of the new civilisation, namely, the simple and beautiful history of the Gospels; we believe that the primitive history of the new doctrine, then propagated, is now familiar to all. A few words, therefore, to exhibit its contrast with the time of its rise, will suffice.

11 Whilst the religions of the ancient world consisted in a general Polytheism, with immoral, vain, absurd ceremonies, Christianity commenced with teaching mankind the sublime doctrine of the unity of God, and its own redemption through Jesus Christ. Whilst the philosophers of antiquity assigned as an end and object of human life on earth, mere material happiness, or a state of idle contemplation, Christianity struck at the root of that spirit of Individualism by proclaiming that he who seeks himself will lose himself—that all human beings are the workmen of the social edifice, and that obedience to the will of God in the accomplishment of a duty is the exclusive condition of our lives.

Christianity proclaimed the unity of all races—the universal brotherhood of nations; it announced that all were equal in the eye of God—that all were the children of God—man and woman—father and son—masters and slaves. To the dry principle of justice of the ancients, in which consisted their highest virtue, Christianity added charity, such as it is described by St. Paul,—that charity, characterised by self-denial—by the sacrifice of the individual to society—and thus formed the Christian justice. Christianity, therefore, brought to humanity a new end, viz., human unity; the means to that end, viz., charity and self-denial; and, moreover, a new law for social relations, viz., liberty and equality, along with a principle of power for Christian societies—morality and devotedness. 11

The principles of Christianity have originated every progress, and every social revolution, during eighteen hundred

years. Much has been done, but much, as was observed before, remains still to be done. It would, indeed, be superfluous to prove and analyse here the authenticity of the primitive sources of the history of Christianity. Even the most sceptical have now abandoned all the former objections raised on the subject; they were truly valueless, and have fallen to dust. But another system of negation has replaced them of late.

It had been advanced by some writers that Jesus Christ had merely summed up the ideas and principles of ancient philosophers, and re-produced them under a new form. An impartial investigation, however, soon banished such opinions. Others brought forward the doctrine of the Essenes among the Jews; and certainly it contains some of the ideas and principles of Christianity, but none of the most important and pre-eminent; and, moreover, those very Jewish authors, Josephus and Philo, who have given an account of the Essene school, both wrote subsequently to Jesus Christ, and have not made the slightest confusion between that Jewish sect and the primitive Christian church. In our time, objections of another nature have risen in France, and more especially in Germany; they aim at nothing less than an absolute denial of the reality of the history of Jesus Christ—and we may say that the celebrated work of Dr. Strauss may be taken as the highest expression of the whole of that system of objections.

All those negative systems take their source in one fundamental error; they all assert that the first century of the Roman empire, which in our opinion is deeply characterised by materialism, and a material tendency, was, on the contrary, an age of mysticism, of mythological ideas, and nameless reveries, and that therefore the writings of that period ought not, and must not, be understood and explained according to their real and natural sense, but must be analysed and expounded in the same manner as the vaguest, most mythical traditions of the remotest antiquity.

Let us return to the dawn of Christianity in the Roman empire.

The propagation of Christianity by the apostles and dis-

ciples of Jesus Christ soon acquired enough importance to alarm the Jews. The persecution of the propagators commenced. The martyrdom of Stephen announced to all Christians what would be the fate of their doctrine in the old world. The conversion of St. Paul came to give it the support of his ardent zeal and of his knowledge. St. Paul became the warmest promoter of the great moral principle of the equality of the Jews and Pagans, and of their union in one sole church. It is believed that it was about forty-two years after Jesus Christ that the apostles dispersed in order to preach the Gospel in the Roman world, especially in the East. Then the first Gospel, that of St. Matthew, was written in the Syrian dialect. Shortly after St. Mark, interpreter of St. Peter, wrote his at Rome. St. John was founding the church of Ephesus; and St. Paul was preaching in the whole of Western Asia, in Macedonia, Greece, and, being arrested at Jerusalem, he was sent to Rome to be judged, whilst his disciple, St. Luke, was preparing the third Gospel.

The Jews, however, were incessantly persecuting the new doctrine. To the sufferings inflicted on the martyrs were added the foulest calumnies, which at last reached the imperial ears. In 64, under Nero, the Christians suffered the first general persecution, which was afterwards so often renewed with incredible fury. The fidelity and blood of the martyrs was not lost, for in less than three centuries the Christian religion seated itself on the Roman throne, and established its imperishable ascendancy.

The Romans acted with great toleration on religious subjects; they admitted in their Pantheon the deities of all the conquered nations; yet their inveterate hatred of Christianity was boundless. They accused the Christians of atheism, of the grossest immoralities, of the most fabulous cruelties, all of which, however, would not have sufficed to call forth so cruel a persecution had not Rome felt herself mortally threatened by the principle of the Christian religion. The morality of Christ attacked the very basis of Roman society; it denied the right of slavery—the distinction of races; it addressed

itself particularly to the poor and the oppressed ; it stigmatised the sensuous excesses and pleasures of the rich ; we cannot wonder, therefore, that the Roman aristocracy became the merciless foe of the Christians. The apostles, on the other hand, strongly impressed upon all, the duty and the necessity of a peaceful propagation ; nevertheless, in the origin of Christianity, many rash and over-zealous proselytes—ignorant of the slow march of all social progress—were endeavouring to obtain by violence an immediate admission of the Christian morality and principles ; and although the Christian church blamed and opposed them, yet the Pagans could take advantage of their imprudent words and efforts as a just reason for their persecution. But the most pre-eminent crime, perhaps, of the Christians was their refusal to worship the emperors ; in refusing to their supreme authority the divine character which was the basis of their power, they were in fact guilty of high treason—of leze-majesty ; and it explains why the wisest of the Roman emperors could not tolerate the Christians. Nevertheless, the Christian spirit prevailed. Terror may succeed in crushing egotistical passions,—impure doctrines ; but it is powerless when the soul is animated by lofty principles of enlightened devotion, of sacrifice and self-denial.

We have stated that the first persecution of the Christians took place under Nero. It was marked by the crucifixion of St. Peter and St. Paul. Afterwards they were left for some time in tranquillity, whilst the Jewish nation was struggling for its independence. After the death of Agrippa, Judea had been declared a Roman province, excepting a small portion of it, which had been conceded to his son, Agrippa the Younger. But the oppression of the Roman governor was intolerable, and in the year 66 the Jews sprang to arms ; Jerusalem became the centre of a vast insurrection. Unfortunately, intestine divisions, subsequently so fatal to them, had commenced their ravages ; the rival parties committed incredible violences against each other, and Judea was covered with fire and blood.

The first Roman general sent against that unfortunate

country was not successful, but Vespasian afterwards subjugated nearly the whole of it, and when he was proclaimed emperor he entrusted the command to his son Titus, and left him the task of subduing the metropolis. The siege of Jerusalem is one of the most memorable events in history. Nothing more awful and more pregnant with moral lessons than the obstinacy and heroism of the Jews against superior forces, their ferocity among each other in the besieged city, and their endless sufferings : the famine was so fearful, that mothers devoured their own children. Finally, Titus triumphed ; the holy city was totally destroyed ; eleven hundred thousand people perished in this war. One hundred thousand were sold as slaves. The remainder of the Jews dispersed themselves among all nations. Once more, under the Emperor Adrian, they assembled and rose in arms, but were soon vanquished and exterminated. From that day, there has been no Jewish nationality ; although scattered among the modern nations, they have given an immortal example of fidelity to their creed, race, and language, in spite of the most degrading and eternal persecutions, in whatever corner of the globe they sought a refuge.

All the Christians who had left Jerusalem before the siege of that city escaped ; but, under the Emperor Domitian, a great number of them again were executed. It was during this period that St. John was banished to the island of Patmos, where he soon died. The Emperor Trajan issued a decree to forbid secret assemblies, and this became an opportunity for persecuting the Christians. Pliny the Younger, then governor of Bythinia, wrote to Trajan a curious letter, which has been preserved, along with the imperial reply. Pliny had taken every means to become acquainted with Christianity : and, in order to know the truth, he had several slaves put to the rack ; he stated in his letter that nearly the whole population of his province was Christian, and that he thought the Christian superstitions quite harmless. Trajan desired that they should not be sought, but that if any of them appeared, and refused to sacrifice to the gods, they must be punished. This

checked partially the persecution. The same system continued under Adrian, Antoninus, and Marcus Aurelius; and though, under the latter emperor, a legion wholly composed of Christians ensured, by its valour, a victory to the Roman army, still the most eminent among the Christians were carried off by persecution. The first apostles who introduced Christianity in Gaul perished in atrocious sufferings.

The stupid ferocity of the Emperor Domitian spared the Christians, but they were again tracked and decimated under Septimus Severus. Their number had increased to a degree alarming to the Roman authorities. Caracalla put a stop to this persecution. Already some of the Roman emperors were favourable to Christianity, such as Alexander Severus and Philip. But with Decius commenced a period of cruelties towards the adherents to the new doctrine, which lasted, almost without interruption, until Constantine. Horrible inventions of every nature were resorted to, in order to induce the faithful Christians to sacrifice to the Pagan deities, and under Diocletian they attained a degree of ferocity that could not be surpassed. From 302 to 311, in every part of the empire, Christian blood was shed in torrents, with unparalleled refinements of atrocity, until the principal author of that persecution, Galerius, depressed by a fearful disease, ordered its cessation; and, soon after, Christianity, triumphant, ascended the throne of the Cæsars, with Constantine. Thus, the new spirit destined to animate the modern societies was victorious, but the consequences of all the past evil were yet to be felt for many ages. Numerous obstacles, as it will be seen in these rapid outlines, were to be conquered before the Christian doctrine could exercise its native, pure influence, through fresh, vigorous and devoted agencies.

The Christian religion assumed at once its sublime character of renovation, and every principle of its morality became for individuals and societies an object to be obtained; it organised itself for a vigorous propagation, and made itself intelligible to all capacities. During this period, faith and sentiment were predominant. Every faculty was concentrated in

one sole object, viz., the knowledge and triumph of the Christian doctrine, the consequences of which were to be realised later. But we cannot enter into the details of the ecclesiastical organisation of the Christian church : its origin has given rise to numerous and deplorable controversies, from the days of Luther to our time, owing to the vagueness and scantiness of the sources and authorities ; for, until the fourth century, all that is known on the subject consists in mere traditions, to which every party has more or less given its own interpretation. These controversies, we firmly believe, have been fatal to the progress of the true Christian spirit ; they have been the instruments of the worst human passions, and may be considered as a desecration of the lofty and pure figure of Christ. The disputed points of the Christian religion which are the source of those bitter animosities do not affect, in any way, the divine principles—the principles of regeneration of our religion ; they chiefly bear on the hierarchy, and on some acts of the worship which by some are understood to be of a nearly symbolical nature, and by others attended with a mysterious power. The tide of human passions has long enough been agitated by these questions, whilst the true civilising and regenerating spirit of Christianity has been almost forgotten, and has only partially penetrated in human societies through its own irresistible force.

It is not expected, therefore, that we should dwell on all the religious controversies, many of which deserve to be stigmatised as pre-eminently unchristian in their tone and object. We will endeavour to soar above them, and only mark the struggles of the Christian societies in their noble effort to obtain a greater intellectual independence, as historical facts ; we will endeavour to prevent our private convictions from clouding the respect that is due to the opinions of others, remembering these words, which all may read in their Bible : “Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons : but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.”—(Acts x. 34, 35.) Let us hope that tolera-

tion will be one of the characteristics of our age; it is indispensable for the conquests of Christianity, and let it be well understood that true toleration is to be tolerant with the intolerant.

The Bishop of Rome became gradually the head of the Christian church, yet without any acknowledged superiority. Nothing satisfactory is really known about the time of his assuming the pontifical authority. Nor is there much abundance of documents respecting the first councils or assemblies of chiefs elected for the discussion of all-important subjects, being, it may be said, a representation of Christendom. It does not seem unreasonable to consider them as a model, a germ, or a dawn of the modern system of representatives so totally alien to the ideas of the ancients. The organisation of the councils was generally much the same as that of which the history is related in the Acts of the Apostles. The councils convoked during this first period were all relative to some heresy or to some private discussion in the Catholic church.

The Christian community was developing itself rapidly, and with a faithful adherence to its principles. At first the poor only were converted; but soon, people from all classes of society joined it, without being deterred by the austere discipline, by privations, abstinence, self-denial. That which Lycurgus had vainly endeavoured to establish at Sparta by his iron laws, was now gratefully accepted by multitudes, independently of the martyrdom which so often crowned a spotless life of devotion, and which was also cheerfully accepted as a proof of Christian fidelity, and of the power of the Christian religion. Such were the miracles worked by faith and by that spiritual doctrine that commanded all men, in the midst of the voluptuous excesses and of the degradation of the Roman society, to be equal, to be charitable, and to forget oneself in order to think only of others. The position of the female sex was also elevated to a legitimate state. Among the ancients, the female sex held a subaltern rank, even in wedlock; but Christianity honoured it, and assigned to it a

just, social importance, not only in marriage, but also before and after. Woman acts a highly-important part in the history of the first Christian ages. The virgins were under the protection of the church, and widows filled functions almost ecclesiastical; they shared with the deacons the service of the churches and the attendance to the poor.

The Christian literature of this first period is of a varied nature. It only offers, till the commencement of the second century, numerous epistles, religious allegories, visions, all of which breathe the faith and simplicity of the apostles, and characterised by a lofty, moral spirit, along with the new ideas professed by the Christians. Towards the middle of the second century, the Christian literature consists chiefly in apologies of the new religion; its members had no security, and many of them addressed themselves to the emperor, in order to justify Christianity, and exhibit the injustices to which they were submitted. Besides these, many religious and moral treatises were also composed, consisting of refutations of Paganism, and learned comparisons between the profane and biblical traditions. St. Justin and Tertullian are the most eminent names of that period.

With the third century Christian literature becomes more scientific. It is the period of the struggles between philosophical systems and the heresies;—it is the period of the commencement of theological science, and of the final constitution of the Christian dogma. The most eminent labours of the third century are those of St. Clement of Alexandria, of Origen, and of St. Cyprian.

At the dawn of Christianity, all devoted Christians had in perfect horror the philosophy of the ancients. But during the third century, Christianity had grown powerful enough to fear no longer any philosophical contact, and the influence of Pagan science manifested itself in its very centre, at Alexandria. Discussions took place among the Christians; and St. Clement, who has left important labours, was so great an admirer of philosophy that he believed that God had given it to the ancients through angels, and also that philosophy was a

prelude to the Gospels as much as the Jewish legislature. He believed that knowledge was the sovereign good ; that man in a perfect state is the true *gnostic* (from *gnosis*, knowledge) —that he understands all, and is subject neither to passions or emotions. Hence the celebrated Alexandrian *gnosticism*. St. Clement, however, is not considered as having introduced anything really heterodox in his Christianity.

But not so with Origen : he taught also at Alexandria, and is celebrated for his numerous works, and for the purity of his life. He yielded to ancient ideas, and wished to apply to Christianity some of the eastern vagaries. In his opinion, all beings are fallen angels who are in expiation, and that a day must come, when, through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, all the angels will be redeemed, and the demons themselves purified. The opinion of Origen became, during the following ages, the cause of warm controversies, and was finally condemned by the church.

The Christian doctrine, by its sudden apparition and propagation, caused a great movement of ideas, and gave an impulse to intellectual activity, even to those who resisted its influence and did not accept its principle. Hence a great number of various systems and many germs of heresies. During this period, all doctrines assumed, like the Christian religion, a religious character, and later only they transformed themselves in purely philosophical systems, whilst many of them returned to their original source, Paganism. During the three first centuries, therefore, the Christian church was assailed by philosophical speculations, most of which had their origin in the old eastern traditions—mixtures of Pantheism and Polytheism, with various systems of Incarnation. The most important among them was that of the Manicheans, which spread with great rapidity, and had towards the end of the third century taken an extensive footing in the East and part of the West.

Those heresies would have been more dangerous for the Christian doctrine had not the frailty of their morality rendered their influence ephemeral, and we all know that truth

and morality alone are eternal; and that all imperfections perish. The history of the world is a perpetual revelation of the divinity. The history and destiny of nations, since the appearance of Christianity, are a testimony that virtue, self-denial, love and liberty are the agencies that raise small states to great powers, whilst self-love, thralldom and corruption cause the ruin of the mightiest empires.

St. Paul, one of the great propagators of Christianity, the great organ of the religion of the spirit, has appealed to the religion of conscience, which dwells in the soul of man; he has expressed the practical tendencies of Christianity applicable to states and empires as well as to individuals:—“Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.”—(Philipp. iv. 8.) *

* See Appendix, No. I.

CHAPTER II.

First Period continued.—The Emperor Constantine.—His Character.—His Institutions.—State of Christianity in his Time.—His Death (337).—His Sons.—Julian, Emperor (361).—Jovian (363).—Valentinian I. and II.—Gratian.—Theodosius the Great.—His Character and Death (395).—The Roman Court.—State of the Empire.—The Colonies.—State of the Roman Armies.—The Germanic Hordes.—Their Situation in Northern Europe.—Invasions of the Huns.—Of the Goths.—Alaric.—Victories of Stilicho.—His Death.—Sack of Rome by Alaric (410).—Kingdom of the Visigoths in Spain.—The Vandals.—Genseric.—Destruction of Carthage.—The Huns.—Attila.—Pillage of Rome by Genseric (455).—Nullity of the Roman Emperors of the West.—Extinction of the Empire of the West (476).—Influence of the Church.—Monastic Communities.—The Fathers of the Church.—The Ecclesiastical Organisation.—The Pontiffs.—Christian Literature of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries.—Arianism.—Its Triumph and Condemnation.—Schism of the Donatists.—Pelagius.—Heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches.—Progress of Christianity.—First Period concluded.

THE history of the Roman empire from Augustus to Constantine presents two very distinct periods: the first bearing all the signs of prosperity and splendour,—the second teeming with dissensions and disorders, harbingers of the calamities which opened the empire to the northern tribes. That part of the history of the Roman empire does not properly belong to Christian civilisation; moreover, it may be remembered that it is not our intention to trace a detailed account of all the emperors and kings, with their military expeditions, but to sketch the great phases of the progress of the Christian nations.

Constantine became sole master of the empire, with the assistance of the Christians; they had, by his time, become powerful enough to have great weight; and they formed even

a political party animated by great energy and devotion. Constantine, putting himself at their head, was indebted to them for the power and greatness of his reign.

No man has been more variously judged in history than Constantine. The passions which then agitated the empire manifested their ardour in the judgments left by the historians of the time, on his character and genius: Eusebius is a sycophantic panegyrist, while Zosimus has left a tissue of calumnies. Most of the historians during the subsequent age, and to our time, have nearly followed the same system: they have either deprecated or admired beyond measure the first Christian emperor. In general, however, there has been more justice and truth on the side of the Christian writers; and we may say that, although Constantine no doubt committed great faults—although criminal actions have sullied his fame—he nevertheless was a man of genius, gifted with many lofty qualities—and his passage on earth is marked by glorious and indelible traces. Brave and skillful as a general, he ensured the security of the empire by successful military expeditions, and the great improvements he effected in the civil institutions seem to prove, as we firmly believe, his conviction that Christianity could yet change the whole state of the world, and that its influence and ascendancy might perhaps restore to the Roman empire that incessant activity which was the instrument of the power and greatness of the eternal city.

Constantine is highly entitled to the glory of a political reformer; for he completely changed the administration, and wrought numerous modifications in the whole legislation. Under his auspices, a new metropolis arose on the spot where stood the antique Byzantium; and soon, Constantinople, the residence of the emperor and of his court, embellished with the spoils of the whole empire—endowed with the same privileges as ancient Rome—left in the shade the antique capital of the world. Thus the old Pagan traditions were annihilated; the old *prestige* of Pagan Rome—so vivid and powerful in the imagination of all nations—was eradicated. The empire underwent a new division, in order to repair, if

possible, the confusion and disorders of the preceding administrations. In short, Constantine, by his legislation, transformed the old Pagan laws ; he commenced a modification of the ancient institutions, which, under various forms and circumstances, have lasted, it may be said, until our time.

Not only did Constantine ensure to all Christians the free exercise and pre-eminence of their religion, but he enacted laws against Paganism and heresies ;—he ordered the celebration of the Sunday, and the restitution to all Christians, of their property confiscated during the last persecution. The churches were richly endowed. He laid, moreover, the foundation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction by giving a legal power to the judgments of the bishops, who were invested with the charge of many of the greatest moral reforms. The Roman law was altered in all its articles the most opposed to Christianity. The sale of children was gradually prohibited. The paternal power was diminished. Immoral marriages were checked. The right of life and death over the slaves was abolished. A new mode of enfranchisement was established—the enfranchisement in the churches : thus, a first homage was paid to that equality which had been proclaimed by Christianity, and which could not yet be realised.

Nevertheless, the Roman empire was continuing to decline. The great efforts of Constantine were of no avail. The causes of that visible decay can easily be seen. The emperor did not possess enough firmness and resolution in the execution of his great plans ; his practical energy was far below the loftiness of his thoughts. His nature was fatally facile. Led too often by his deep sympathies or violent passions, under the influence of the latter he sacrificed his son Crispus, who had been calumniously accused by his mother-in-law, and he discovered too late the innocence of the esteemed victim. Skilful and crafty men who had his confidence rendered the administration oppressive, and his government became a luxurious despotism. On the other hand, when Christianity became the reigning religion, it was accepted by a vast number of men who were merely led by interest, and among

whom the Pagan sensual passions and idle habits were continued. And again, the greatest, no doubt, of all obstacles to the regenerating efficacy of Christianity arose from those fatal heresies which, during the fourth and fifth centuries, wasted all the Christian activity on purely theological subjects. The empire was divided into hostile sects, by which it was deeply stirred and disorganised; and not being repressed with courage and skill, a multitude of men found in them a justification of their egotism, and secretly encouraged causes of dissensions favourable to their rapacity. A wretched administration had ruined all resources; it became easy, therefore, for all those barbarian hordes, who had so long envied the Roman wealth, to rush on, and break down that huge, massive body, called the Roman empire, which now possessed neither activity of power nor moral unity.

Constantine, at his death (337), left three sons, who divided the empire: Constantine, the eldest, governed the western provinces; Constans, the youngest, obtained Italy, Africa, and Illyria; Constantius, the East.

Fifteen years afterwards, the latter re-united the whole empire. The two former waged war with each other; Constantine perished at the battle of Aquilea; his victorious brother Constans became the victim of a rebellion of his generals, and was murdered; and Constantius, after a long and unfortunate war against the Persians, attacked the rebels, defeated them, and found himself sole emperor. But there were, besides, two nephews of the great Constantine,—Gallus and Julian. The first had governed the East during the civil war, but his pride and excesses furnished the emperor with sufficient reasons to have him executed. Julian, after the war in the West, obtained the government of Gaul. He distinguished himself by the wisdom of his government, and by his brilliant campaigns against the Germans. Constantius, jealous of his fame, wished to withdraw the legions from his command, but Julian was proclaimed emperor by them, contrary to his own wishes, in Paris, where he resided; and the emperor, furious, marched

against him, but died on the road. Julian remained without any competitor (361).

The Roman empire, however, was losing that new spirit of vigour and renovation it had received from the great Constantine. The administration was entrusted to worthless hands. Constantius developed the germs of division of the preceding reigns by becoming the warm promoter of the heresy of the Arians, and, with Julian, the evil grew deeper. He had been trained in the Pagan philosophy, and ever nourished a secret hatred for the Christian princes of his family. He abjured Christianity, and resolved, with singular fanaticism, to restore Paganism. Julian, as well as Constantine, has never had any impartial historians; however, his blind devotion to the old religion evinces a singular ignorance of the state of his time. Restorations are seldom lasting; that of Julian did not survive him. He perished in an expedition against the Persians, and Jovian, who was proclaimed his successor, was a zealous Christian (363).

Jovian, after a disgraceful peace with the Persians, did not reign more than twenty months. Valentinian I., his successor, divided the empire with his brother Valens. He died, after several successful expeditions against the Germans, and was succeeded by his sons, Valentinian II. and Gratian. In the mean time, Valens, who governed the East, perished in a battle against the Goths, the first of those numerous tribes whose migrations I shall soon briefly relate. The young emperor Gratian called to his assistance a distinguished Spaniard, who had been banished from court,—Theodosius, and associated him with himself in the empire (379).

Theodosius, for a time, reigned, under the name of Gratian and Valentinian. He became sole master of the empire after his victories over the rebels, who caused the death of the two emperors. In 383, the discontent of the Roman troops, and the revolt of Maximus in Britain, was followed by the flight and death of Gratian. Theodosius, unable to avenge his benefactor, dissembled his resentment, and accepted a treaty

of peace offered by Maximus ; but when the latter, in 387, invaded Italy and attacked Valentinian, Theodosius took arms in his favour, and Maximus was defeated and killed. Soon after, the Frank Arbogastes rebelled also against Valentinian, caused him to be murdered, and had Eugenius proclaimed emperor. Theodosius again prepared for war—and again victory crowned his arms, but he only survived his triumph a few months (395).

Theodosius deserved the surname of *Great*. He was illustrious by his military talents—by his skill in the administration of the empire—by his religious zeal, and his private virtues ; but his successors, like those of the great Constantine, did not take advantage of all the good he had done. His two sons divided the empire, which was never to be united again. Arcadius obtained the East, that portion destined to languish during ten centuries longer ; and Honorius the West, whose existence was not to be of long duration. Under Honorius and his successors came down those avalanches of northern tribes which were destined to change the face of the world.

Theodosius, as well as Constantine, struggled in vain to check the decay of the empire. All the modifications they introduced were not equal to the virulence of the disease. The manners had certainly improved greatly under the influence of the Christian princes, and a greater decorum had taken the place of the general depravation ; but the amelioration was chiefly manifest in private life. None of the political institutions, nor the church, nor the emperors, had evinced any real moral result of the Christian ascendancy. The court had assumed all the Eastern luxuries and pomp ; a servile veneration surrounded the person of the emperor. The high functions of ancient Rome had taken a different character. The Roman senate was nothing more than a court of justice or a municipal council ; a similar senate had been organised at Constantinople. The civil dignities had lost their importance, and everything emanated from the emperor and his privy council. The functions of the palace had given birth to a new species of nobility ; and then emerged those honorary titles, those pompous dignities of the palace, which became the ob-

ject of the ambition of the rich. Many of them were retained in the following ages, especially those of *Comites* (companions of the emperor, *counts*), and of *Duces* (generals, *dukes*). This new aristocracy possessed immense wealth, and enjoyed numerous privileges.

The finances were in a deplorable state, yet the taxes were enormous, especially in the cities. An edict of Caracalla had given to all the inhabitants of the empire the right and privileges of Roman citizenship. All the cities were governed, therefore, by their magistrates elect, having, as their head, a senate and a municipal council, called *Curia*. The misfortunes of the times fell more directly on the members of that body, on the *Curiales*. They were, in truth, responsible for the payment of the taxes; and, in the case of a deficit, their property was confiscated. A moderate fortune was quite sufficient for a man to be forcibly enrolled in a *Curia*. The function was hereditary, and corporal punishments were inflicted on those who endeavoured to escape; it became gradually so oppressive, that many preferred even slavery, and sought, when possible, a refuge among the new class of men that had just risen, viz., the members of the *Colonies*.

Probably the colonies commenced when barbarians were transplanted on the Roman soil. At the time of Constantine, a great number of them were scattered all over the empire. The people of the colonies (the *Coloni*) were distinguished from the other slaves in their not being the property of a master, but in belonging to the soil, from which they could not be separated. They could only be sold with the land, and enjoyed their liberty on the estate to which they were tied, provided they paid to the proprietor the produce of their culture. The *Coloni* could marry a free woman; they served in the army, and were capable of holding property. They were, however, considered as slaves, and lived in great poverty. The man, although free, who assumed that function, became a slave member of a colony after a certain lapse of time.

The army had become permanent, and the military profession was no longer the first duty of every citizen. None en-

tered the military life unless attracted by honours, privileges, and immunities; so that the formation of an army became daily more difficult. Under Constantine, foreigners and barbarians were received in the military ranks, which soon had very few Romans, but were filled by men from all nations, who were more disposed to live upon the empire than ready to defend it, although distinguished by their physical strength and courage—qualities that were no longer to be found among the Romans. Measures were taken to defend the empire from invasions, which are not unlike the military organisation of the barbarian conquerors. A part of the army was distributed on the frontiers, in fixed camps, fortified, and permanently settled. Each soldier had a portion of land and slaves, and was free from taxes; this situation, and its advantages, were hereditary; the inferior officers were elected, and the chiefs appointed, by the emperor. Such a military post was already called *Benefice*, and was, no doubt, one of the origins of the Fiefs of the Middle Ages. Still, all those military precautions were in vain. The Roman empire was no longer able to repel the new races that threatened it. In former times, Rome had sternly punished the German hordes that had attacked her, and had pursued them into their own forests,—whilst now, these, on the contrary, were preparing for easy triumphs. But a word on their state previous to the great invasions.

Tacitus, in his description of Germany, gives an account of a great number of tribes, generally at war with each other, although sometimes united in a federacy. At the time we are speaking of, Western Germany was divided into two leagues: the first, that of the Franks (Sicambri, Cherusci, Catti, Ripuari), inhabiting all the districts of the Lower Rhine; they had already made themselves known by an invasion (237), and part of them seem later to have entered the service of the empire, and undertaken the defence of that frontier.

The other—that of the Alemanni—is mentioned, for the first time, under Caracalla, and occupied afterwards the present Bavaria. At the time of Tacitus, a powerful race, that of the Suevi, extended over all the regions between the Elbe

and the Vistula; but the league of the Suevi had no longer its former importance, although some of its hordes had advanced towards the south, and, among them, the Burgundians, who were the eastern neighbours of the Alemanni, and the Longobards, or Lombards, who, from the Oder, had descended on the Danube. The league of the Saxons occupied the lands in the rear of the Franks. The Sarmatians had replaced the lost multitude of the Scythians (from whom they probably descended), along the Danube, the Black and Caspian Seas. They were themselves reduced to submit to a new domination. The Goths, concerning whose origin there have been so many various hypotheses made, had successively assailed, and established themselves over, the whole of Dacia and on nearly all the shores of the Black Sea. Tacitus believes the Goths to have emerged from the banks of the Baltic Sea, where they, no doubt, formerly had arrived as conquerors. The Vandals, Rugii, Gepidæ, and Heruli, seem to have been as many Gothic tribes. In their present settlements, however, the Dniester divided them into two separate nations, the Ostrogoths (Goths of the East), governed by the celebrated chief Hermanrich; and the Visigoths (Goths of the West), under the command of Athanaric. The ferocious race of the Alani lived at the north-east of the Goths, on the banks of the Volga and the shores of the Caspian Sea. Such was the situation of Northern Europe when, under the reign of Valens, a torrent of Asiatic hordes rolled upon Europe.

According to the Chinese annals, the formidable, barbarous nation of the Hiong-nu occupied central Asia about three hundred years before the Christian era. The emperors of China had suffered greatly from their incursions, when they finally destroyed them, partly with the assistance of one of those very races, the Sien-pi. However, the bravest among the hordes of Hiong-nu carved their way towards the West, and, under the name of Huns, rushed upon Europe, and gave the first impulse to all the subsequent migrations. Perhaps, instead of a regular emigration, it was only, as it has been supposed, one of those temporary conquering incursions com-

mon to all those nations. But, whichever it may be, the Huns crossed the Volga, and rushed upon the Alani; these fell back upon the Goths, annihilated the kingdom of Hermanrich, and attacked the Visigoths, who fled towards the Danube, and humbly implored the Emperor Valens to allow them to pass that river.

The Goths had embraced Christianity, but were chiefly Arians. The Arian bishops had introduced their doctrine among the Goths before their passage of the Danube, and the whole nation had received this form of Christianity. The imperial ministers, firmly attached to Arianism, hoping to be powerfully supported by this nation of Christian barbarians, granted their request, and more than one million of Goths, of whom about two hundred thousand were warriors, penetrated into the empire (376).

Thus the Goths were admitted; they arrived as suppliants, but soon became mortal foes. They were celebrated for their ferocity, and the restless violence of their habits. They had been allowed to keep their arms, and soon, molested by the Imperial officers, this humbled multitude broke out in a fierce revolt, and advanced upon Constantinople, after having been joined by other hordes. Valens marched against them, met them near Adrianople, and perished in a fearful defeat. Theodosius, however, after a war of four years, subdued them. They were permitted to settle on the Roman territory, and to pay a tribute. An army of forty thousand men was raised among them for the defence of the realm. The weakness of the Roman empire explains the power and force of its enemies. As long as Theodosius lived, the Goths were kept in awe; but his sons, void of the courage and genius of the father, allowed mercenary barbarians to regulate the affairs of the empire, whilst they were themselves absorbed by the vile intrigues of the palace. The Goths broke out anew. They sprang to arms. Alaric was at their head; during three years he ravaged Macedonia and Greece, and the eastern Emperor Arcadius obtained peace by appointing him master-general of the Eastern Illyricum (398).

This new revolt of the Goths had been excited by the intrigues of the palace. Rufinus, the confidential minister of Arcadius, had himself stimulated the revolt of the barbarians, in order to create inevitable difficulties to his great rival Stilicho. He certainly succeeded in his object, but compromised the safety of the empire, and he met with his death in the intricate net of intrigues which he had formed. The Eastern empire, having thus received many cruel lessons from past experience, succeeded, at last, in sheltering itself from new invasions, and we may now abandon its history, in order to behold the fall of that of the West.

Alaric, therefore, was reigning in Eastern Illyricum, and soon threatened the whole West. In 400, he advanced towards Italy, and subdued Istria and Venetia; but Stilicho checked his progress, defeated him at the battle of Pollentia, and drove him out of Italy. Another danger, however, was threatening the empire. An immense army, composed of Suevi, Vandals, Burgundians, and Goths, had assembled under the savage Radagaisus; it crossed the Alps, and fell upon Italy. Stilicho attacked them, and again was victorious. The barbarians fled, or were destroyed. Radagaisus was put to death (405); but, on the following year, the wreck of his army assembled on the Rhine, and crossed that river. The Franks in the Roman service vainly endeavoured to defend its shores. During two years, the Alani, Suevi, and Vandals, ravaged Gaul; then they crossed the Pyrenees, continued the same excesses in Spain, and, lastly, established themselves in that country,—the Suevi in the south-west, the Vandals and the Alani in the north. The Burgundians established themselves in Gaul, in the regions of the rivers Rhone and Saone, which have preserved their name. Towards the same period, the Anglo-Saxons were crossing the sea to settle in Britain, and, soon after, the provinces of Gaul being a prey to disorders and revolutions, saw the Franks, their allies, transformed into formidable enemies.

In the meantime Alaric was collecting new troops. A secret correspondence and understanding existed between him and

Stilicho, who was also an Arian. The latter, it seems, aimed at nothing less than to invest his own son with the Imperial purple, with the assistance of the Goths and Pagans of the empire. His treason being discovered, he was assailed on all sides, fled to Ravenna, where he was murdered, and the glory of his victories did not shelter his body from the insults of a multitude that had knelt and trembled before him. Alaric, however, indignant against the imperial ministers for eluding the payment of the four thousand pounds of gold due to him as a tribute, and pressed by the malcontents of Italy, crossed the Alps and the Po, with bold and rapid marches, pillaged all the cities on his way, increased his forces by the accession of thirty thousand auxiliaries, and pitched his camp under the walls of Rome. Plague and famine had reduced the Eternal city. Alaric accepted an enormous ransom to save it from plunder; he raised the siege; but the weak Emperor Honorius, although no warrior, refused all negotiations for peace; then Alaric, full of wrath, marched upon Rome a second time, named a new emperor, Attalus, and, after two years of fruitless negociations and partial warfare, Rome, that had fallen again into the hands of Honorius, beheld, for the third time, Alaric and his Goths under her walls. The king of the Goths entered that imperial city which had subdued and civilised so considerable a part of mankind, and he delivered it, during six days, to the licentious fury of the tribes of Germany and Scythia (410).

After the sack of Rome, Alaric retired to the south of Italy, where he died, in the same year. His brother Adolphus succeeded him; and concluded a peace with Honorius, who gave him his sister in marriage, and received him and his Goths in the service of the empire, with the mission of opposing the barbarians in Gaul. Adolphus, accordingly, took possession of Aquitania, then crossed the Pyrenees, and snatched a portion of Spain from the hands of the Vandals and Alani. His successor, Vallia, continued his projected expeditions and settlements, after which was formed the kingdom of the Visigoths; in the north of Spain.

At this period, Italy was exhausted. The incursions of the barbarians had reduced the citizens to the most extreme wretchedness. All the afflicting pictures, left by many historians, of the universal desolation, are, it has been ascertained, far below the truth. The prestige of ancient Rome—of the Eternal City—had vanished before the sacrilege of the Goths. It was even no longer the residence of the emperor, who dwelt in the opulent Ravenna. The empire had lost many of its finest provinces; a portion of Spain was no longer Roman, and the submission of the Visigoths, who occupied the other part of that country, was merely nominal. It was the same with the portion of Gaul held by the Burgundians, and the northern part of that country, where the Franks had just established themselves.

Africa alone had not yet suffered, but the dark clouds of calamity were not far distant. The western Emperor Honorius had survived twelve years the sack of Rome, and was succeeded by his nephew Valentinian III. (424). A usurper, John, principal secretary to the former emperor, disturbed the commencement of this reign, but was defeated by Boniface, who received the government of Africa. This province suffered all the horrors of an invasion owing to a court rivalry and intrigue. Boniface being victim of a calumny of the other general, Ætius, fearing to be recalled, and no doubt animated by a feeling of vengeance, imprudently sought the assistance of the Vandals of Spain, who had gradually been pushed towards the south by the Visigoths. Their king, Genseric, sailed towards the African shores: in vain Boniface, undeceived and repentant, wished to oppose his invasion. Genseric was Arian, and all the Donatists and Arians of Africa hailed him with joy, and assisted him. He defeated Boniface in two pitched battles, and forced him to withdraw to Italy, where he perished in a conflict with his rival Ætius (432). The Vandal king, however, did not achieve the conquest of Africa without resistance or delay. Eight years elapsed from the defeats of Boniface to the reduction of Carthage. That wealthy and opulent metropolis had relaxed her vigilance after the trea-

cherous protestations of friendship of Genseric, who thus surprised the city, 585 years after the destruction of that republic by the younger Scipio. The destructive rage and avarice of the Vandals is celebrated in history. They acted in Africa as everywhere else ; they established their domination over streams of blood and heaps of ruins (439).

But a more fearful storm, if possible, had fallen upon Rome. That merciless, formidable race, the Huns, who first had given the impulse to that general movement of nations, were in their turn pouring upon the West—Attila, the “scourge of God,” was at their head. Genseric had sought his alliance, thus securing for himself the possession of Africa, and the subtle Vandal excited the king of the Huns to invade the eastern empire, where Theodosius II. had succeeded Arcadius. Theodosius solicited the clemency of Attila, who imperiously dictated the most harsh and humiliating conditions of peace. But Honoria, sister of Valentinian, transmitted to Attila a ring, and conjured him to claim her as a lawful spouse. The king of the Huns had received these advances with disdain, till, awakened by the passions of avarice and ambition, he sent a formal demand of the princess Honoria, with a just and equal share of the imperial patrimony. A firm but temperate refusal was communicated to his ambassadors. Attila, with his innumerable army, reached the Rhine after a march of 700 or 800 miles, crossed that river, and advanced into the heart of Gaul. The Roman general, Ætius, collected an army, was joined by the Visigoths, Burgundians, and Franks, who united to oppose the common foe—the terrible destroyer. Attila being defeated in a great and bloody battle at Chalons, in the plains of Champagne (451), retreated, and his invasion of Italy in the following year, which gave rise to the foundation of the republic of Venice, owing to the fugitives having fixed themselves on rocks and small rocky islands in the middle of the sea, was checked by the skilful negociation of the Pope Leo, whose genius and ardent zeal obtained the deliverance of Italy. Soon after, Attila died during a night of debauchery, and with him vanished the terror inspired by the

name of the Huns. His vast empire was totally subverted and soon extinguished, so much so, that the modern historian can scarcely find any traces of his successors.

The calamities of Italy had gradually subdued all consciousness of freedom and glory. Rome was approaching her end; she was, however, to suffer again the disgrace and calamities of a barbarian invasion and conquest. Valentinian III., universally abhorred for his vices, ravished the wife of Maximus, a wealthy senator, who, stimulated by revenge and ambition, had the emperor stabbed to the heart in the field of Mars by two intrepid barbarians. The injured husband heard himself saluted emperor by the unanimous voice of the senate and the people. But whether from the blind impulse of lust, or of revenge, he offered violence to the widow of the emperor, Empress Eudoxia. Her grief and resentment sought an avenger, and she secretly implored the aid of the king of the Vandals. Genseric disembarked at the mouth of the Tiber, and boldly advanced to the gates of Rome. Maximus, incapable of administering and defending the empire, was assaulted, killed, and his mangled body cast into the Tiber. The defenceless city being opened, offered no resistance to the barbarians, and Rome and its inhabitants were delivered to the licentiousness of the Vandals and Moors, whose blind passions avenged the injuries of Carthage. The pillage lasted fourteen days and nights. All the public and private wealth—sacred or profane treasures—were diligently transported to the vessels of Genseric, who immediately hoisted sail, and returned with a prosperous navigation to the port of Carthage (455).

The emperors who succeeded Maximus scarcely deserve to be mentioned. The first was Avitus, whom the stern Ricimer, the chief of the barbarians in the service of Rome, deposed. Afterwards, the virtuous Majorian presents a great and heroic character. His reforms exasperated all the selfish lovers of abuses. Ricimer inflamed the passions of the barbarians, who compelled him to abdicate. At the command of the chief, the senate elected Severus, whose reign was merely nominal. Anthemius was afterwards elevated to the empire, but discord

having taken place between him and Ricimer, the latter collected his barbarians, appointed Olybrius as rival emperor, and marched upon Rome; the great and unfortunate city was again taken and plundered, and the unfortunate Anthemius massacred (472).

Olybrius after a reign of seven months died; two months after a painful disease had delivered Italy of the tyrant Ricimer. Glycerius, an obscure soldier, was invested with the purple, and soon put aside by Julius Nepos, the emperor elect by the Byzantine court. The new emperor, trembling before the seditions of the generals, fled to Dalmatia, where he was afterwards assassinated. The troops proclaimed their chief Orestes, who, declining the purple for himself, accepted it for his son Romulus-Augustulus, the last emperor of the West. All those barbarian legions composed of Heruli, Alani, and others, claimed a *third* part of the lands of Italy. Orestes rejected the demand, upon which Odoacer, a bold barbarian, followed by a torrent of confederates, overwhelmed Orestes, who was executed, and Odoacer was saluted King of Italy by the military acclamation of the confederates (476).

Thus was extinguished the Roman empire of the West. We behold, therefore, at this period, a kingdom of Italy, a Visigoth kingdom in Spain, a kingdom of Burgundy, and soon a France. But nothing existed again like a Western empire till Charlemagne. The emperors of the East, however, endeavoured, during their short epochs of felicity, to re-assume the rights of the empire over Italy and Gaul, and for some time the provinces that had escaped the barbarians nominally acknowledged their authority—mere shadow of power, which soon vanished. The temporal destinies of Rome were at an end. Yet, the migrations of the northern hordes were not terminated. After Odoacer and the Heruli, Italy passed into the hands of the Ostrogoths,—then into those of the eastern emperors, and afterwards was seized by the Lombards. In the north and east of Europe, barbarian hordes assailed each other, until the tenth century; and after the Huns, a multitude of Tartars carved their way towards Europe,

and established an ephemeral domination on the frontiers of the old Roman empire. They were the Avari, the Bulgarians, the Chozars, and lastly the Hungarians. The regions abandoned by the Germanic tribes in their emigration towards the west and south were occupied from the Baltic to the Adriatic, from the Elbe to the Vistula, by the new race of the Slavonians. But this history belongs to a subsequent period.

During this first period of the history of Europe—from Constantine to the fall of the Western empire—the church exercised the most pre-eminent influence; it offers the spectacle of a boundless and universal activity in intellectual labours, and in the progressive development of order and morality so paramount in the advancement of civilisation. The great feature of the history of the Christian church during this period consists in the struggles with heresies—a vehement opposition to all those opinions which tended to overthrow, or disfigure, the Christian principles and the Christian morality. Notwithstanding the numberless obstacles encountered, the Christian church consolidated her constitution, and regulated those hierarchical institutions, at the head of which now appears, in a conspicuous position, the Bishop of Rome. The church was propagating the Christian doctrine in the most distant regions, and taking, at the same time with an equal zeal, an important part in the political affairs of the period, although impotent in checking its disastrous effects.

Christendom was agitated by deep commotions, the causes of which are easily shown. When the Roman emperor embraced Christianity, the proselytes became naturally numerous, and the Christian doctrine was accepted by a great number without much faith or any convictions as to its sublimity. This new multitude of indifferent Christians were indeed half Pagans, and became the promoters of those divergent, egotistical doctrines more favourable to their tastes, habits, and passions. They naturally gave the preference to a heresy that justified their selfish indifference to the truth that enjoined sacrifices and self-denial. They changed their religion

as they would have done their philosophical opinions. But this was the case more especially in the higher classes. Among the people, on the contrary, were manifested that fervent zeal and ardour inspired by a new tenet. In our time of material agitations and interests, it is not easy for all to understand clearly the singular passions that were roused among so many, of all conditions, by the theological quarrels. In truth, people were then divided by mere questions of ordination ; a theological discussion—a schism, would foment furious attacks between parties in cities, agitate whole masses, and drive them to despair and fury ; whilst in modern times the same passions are more excited by questions of organisation and politics. Now, it is somewhat better understood, thanks to the progress of enlightenment, that theological questions, and variance of opinions on minor religious subjects, are a dead letter with regard to Christian civilisation, and that the lofty and eternal principles of Christianity alone have a right to rouse our efforts and energies until their blessings are enjoyed by all.

The excesses of any one class of society, whatever they may be, have always engendered a re-action in another. Thus, the loose and sensual Christianity of the wealthy and of the great, gave rise to a most singular asceticism. So early as the commencement of the fourth century, thousands of Christians had fixed their abode in the dreary sands and the morasses of higher Egypt. They lived in perpetual religious solitude and austere penance. And strange enough, that which might appear most adverse to the universal dissemination of Christianity eventually tended to its advantage. Cœnobitism soon became the refuge of all ardent Christians ; and gradually, the hermitage of the ascetic grew up into a convent ; the establishment of religious fraternities in the wildest solitudes gathered round them a Christian community ; they naturally propagated the Christian worship, which was aided by the spiritual services of the monks, who, though not generally ordained as ecclesiastics, furnished a constant supply for ordination. Long after Christianity had gained the predominance in the towns, many rural districts in most parts

had remained attached, by undisturbed habit, to the ancient superstition--and now they were slowly brought by the monks within the pale of the new religion. Thus, the monastic communities commenced, in the more remote and less populous districts of the Roman world, those beneficial changes which they afterwards carried on beyond the frontiers. They worked on silently, but successfully, in their aggressions against the lurking Paganism, as afterwards they introduced Christian civilisation among the barbarous tribes of the north of Europe.

The clergy then was not yet corrupt, although it possessed very great influence, and was accumulating great riches. Its position contributed greatly to its active and good conduct: a multitude of eminent men exercised in the clergy an intellectual ascendant; they communicated much more with the poor than with the rich; the ecclesiastical functions were elective, and moreover the people in their fervent orthodoxy were exercising over the ecclesiastical body a sort of anxious watchfulness. Then appeared those eminent men who honour the infancy of Christian civilisation--those immortal fathers, who with reason and justice blended the love of society with the love of religion; and who, by their writings, their zeal and their labours, and by their influence over princes and nations, were the instruments of the great triumphs of the Christian religion and of Christian love.

The ecclesiastical hierarchy, I have said, was now completed, and the administration of the church was regulated and finally settled. It remained for a long time a model for all political administrations. We do not enter into the details of the ecclesiastical organisation; they will be found in the works referred to; but that organisation certainly became a great instrument in promoting public order and civil legislation. The ecclesiastical laws were daily increasing in number; they often were applied to civil affairs; and the great number of them issued by the councils of this period have remained as a basis of church discipline. At this period the church of Rome was standing pre-eminent in the reverence

and esteem of nations. The letters and decisions of the Pope were received as if they had been imperial constitutions. All the great men of the church, St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, gave their assistance to this central power, which was considered as the safeguard of unity. The most eminent Pontiffs laboured successfully during this period in building up that ecclesiastical power and supremacy which was so great and bold during the Middle Ages.

It was during the fourth and fifth centuries that Christian literature shone in its greatest splendour. It was adorned by the labours of men of the most lofty genius, and never since has Christian literature been so pregnant with greatness and fecundity. The literature of this period is characterised by an exclusive spirit of propagation and controversy;—it consists in a multitude of commentaries on the scriptures—of moral treatises—theological discussions—homilies—sermons, &c.; all distinguished by their superiority, and forming the treasures of theology and ecclesiastical history. Many of their authors acquired a universal fame that has not been impaired by the tide of so many centuries. Among the most pre-eminent of the Greeks are St. Gregory Nazianzum, so intellectual and imaginative in his writings; St. Athanasius, whose life was one unwearied, incessant strife, and whose history, one long controversy,—whose memory is revered with actual adoration, both in Catholic and Protestant countries; St. Chrysostom, whose powerful Grecian eloquence swayed the popular mind in Constantinople; St. Cyril, who after the Emperor Julian's death selected fragments of his works for confutation. Among the Latins,—St. Jerome, who transplanted the monastic spirit and opinions of Syria into Rome, and brought into the East something of the severer reasoning of the Latin world; St. Ambrose, so eminent for the masculine strength of his style, and his stern, conscientious energy; St. Augustine, perhaps the most permanently influential of all, whose comprehensive and systematic views were animated by the intense passion of an African mind. The virtues and labours of all, tended to the unity and power

of the church, and have deserved the eternal veneration of Christendom ; they all united in one common cause, and their influence compelled the world into a temporary unity, till new heresies unsettled again the yet unfirm basis of Christian faith.

The heresies of the three first centuries were too foreign to the fundamental principles of Christianity to offer any danger ; they emanated from pagan, pantheistic, philosophical sources—from the confused traditions scattered in the East, and could not affect the spirit and essence of Christianity ; but now the controversies were on subjects affecting the Christian dogma itself ; and after several heretical efforts—some obscure, others easily silenced—new questions were raised, which attacked the Christian dogma in its vitality. At the commencement of the fourth century, the great question agitated before, on the nature of the Godhead, re-appeared with a new form, fresh vigour, great *éclat*, and shook Christianity to its foundation—it was when Arius made public his heterodox opinions. Arius of Alexandria and his disciples maintained that the *Logos*, or Son of God, so clearly defined in the gospel of St. John, was a dependent and spontaneous production, created from nothing, by the will of the Father—that the Son by whom all things were made, had been begotten before all worlds, and that the longest of the astronomical periods could be compared only as a fleeting moment to the extent of his duration ; and yet that this duration was not infinite, but that there *had* been a time which preceded the generation of the *Logos* ;—that on this only begotten Son the Almighty Father had transferred his spirit and his glory, although he shone only with a reflected light—in short, they taught something like a negation of the divinity of Christ. The Christian world seemed awed by the social importance of this new doctrine ; it beheld its propagation with terror, and opposed it with vehemence. The very existence of Christianity appeared in question. If Arianism triumphed, said they, Jesus Christ was nothing more than a great philosopher—his morality, a human

opinion—and his dogmas, vain promises—and Polytheism would survive and triumph again.

Arius was assailed with acrimony. Several learned bishops maintained his doctrine, and were defending it with an ardent zeal. The Emperor Constantine interfered to allay the strife, and convoked a council-general of all Christian bishops, to discuss the tenets of Arius. It was the great Council of Nice, in the year 325. Constantine seems to have been present during the greater part of the sittings, softening all asperities, and encouraging peace and union. A solemn anathema of this Christian senate was pronounced against Arius and his adherents; they were banished by the civil power, and especially interdicted from disturbing the peace of Alexandria by their presence.

But Arianism, although condemned, was not extinguished. The Arian party gradually grew into favour. Constantine himself modified considerably his opinion on the subject, and recalled Arius from his exile; and, in spite of the furious hostility of Athanasius, the new bishop of Alexandria, the Arians, strengthened by the authority of the emperor, were already raising the voice of triumph when Arius died (336).

The Arians continued their victories in nearly the whole of the East, while the West, with the exception of a few bishops, was faithfully orthodox. Some of the emperors—Constantius and Valens, for instance—were violent Arians. Dissensions and struggles continued between the two parties, with occasional but vain efforts of reconciliation by councils, till the accession of Theodosius, who finally restored peace and unity to the Christian church. In 381, he convoked another great council at Constantinople, which confirmed all the proceedings of that of Nice, and condemned, afterwards, all the doctrines opposed to the church, and all heresies. The decision of the council, however, did not finally exterminate Arianism, although it gave it a mortal blow in the Roman empire. Probably Arianism would have perished then, had it not been for the invasion of the barbarians, who, as stated before, had all been converted to Christianity by Arian bishops.

But the decadence of Arianism did not lessen the Christian

activity. Proselytism, controversies, private questions of opinions or persons, continued to keep Christendom in a perpetual excitement. Priscillian renewed in Spain some of the Manichean tenets, and made many proselytes, although himself and his followers were put to death for heresy. The doctrine of Origen was revived in the West, and finally condemned by the Pontifical authority; yet it long preserved partisans in the East, and the existence of that sect furnished a pretext for persecuting the noble and eloquent St. Chrysostom, because he had the Christian courage to stigmatised the profligacy of the empress and of the court.

The schism of the Donatists had long been a source of strife in Africa. It had commenced with the third century. In 311, Cæcilian was raised to the see of Carthage, and the Numidian bishops, not having participated in the election, considered Cæcilian as irregularly appointed, and proceeded to elect Majorinus. The cause was brought before Constantine, who delegated the judgment to the bishops of Gaul. The authors of this schism assumed the name of Donatists, from Donatus, one of the most persevering and vigorous characters among them, who was appointed bishop, or rather anti-bishop, on the death of Majorinus. The Donatists soon scornfully rejected the authority of the Government, which had been invoked by them. At length the indignation of the Government had recourse to violent measures, but they defied the armed interference. The whole African province had espoused their quarrel, and, during thirteen years, was ravaged by a most cruel civil war. Nothing has ever exceeded the ferocious excesses and licentious outrages of the Donatists. They bear a great similarity to the mad fanaticism of the Anabaptists of Munster, in 1534. Thus Christianity was liable to revolting excesses; but let it not be forgotten that it was at a period when its spirit and influence were confused—misapprehended; and, moreover, religion rarely bursts into fanaticism unless maddened by persecution.

The Donatists were marked with reprobation in condemnatory edicts. In 411, Honorius ordered a great conference, which somewhat appeased the dissensions; yet the sect, al-

though weakened, roused when Genseric came to attack Africa with his Vandals, and completed the schism by treason, in opening the province to the barbarians.

The doctrines of Pelagius, a monk of Bretany, made known during the first part of the fifth century, differed also considerably from those established by the church. A great obscurity clouds all the discussions they engendered. Even the decisions of the councils merely anathematised the propositions of Pelagius, without giving, in their place, positive affirmations. However, his controversy with Augustine exhibits the broad features of his philosophical principles. Pelagius asserted the entire freedom of the will, and restricted the sense of the doctrine of the divine grace, confining it to the influences of the divine revelation; with him, conscience was the sole great regulator of man, with reference to good and evil, and the laws of the moral world alone were admitted by him. The church could not allow such doctrines to pass unnoticed. The Pelagians were opposed by St. Jerome and St. Augustine. They were condemned by three councils, at different periods, the last of which took place at Carthage, in 418, and was celebrated for the presence, activity, and surpassing influence of St. Augustine. Pelagianism was afterwards proscribed in the whole of the West, and, soon after, equally condemned in the East. But the subsequent writings of St. Augustine on the subject being less vehement and forcible, and bearing even a character of obscurity or doubt on some of those questions, they gave rise to a semi-Pelagianism. The semi-Pelagians became very numerous, in Gaul especially. Pelagius died in 430, and the religious dissensions which originated with him only terminated in 529 by the Council of Orange, in which the doctrine of St. Augustine was finally accepted by all, with very few restrictions.

The church was still more agitated by the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches. These referred to the incarnation of Christ. Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, towards the year 430, maintained that the Blessed Virgin had given birth to a man who was merely a holy, perfect man, but not a God

—that the *Logos*, the Spirit of God, only lived in him—and that there was no real union between God and man. This was a new form of Arianism, which excited general attention. Letters on the subject were exchanged between the Pope, St. Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, and Nestorius. At last, a council was convoked at Ephesus in 431, when the new heresy was formally condemned, and Nestorius deposed and exiled. Soon after, however, the opponents of Nestorius fell into the extreme opposite of his ideas. They maintained that the substance and body of Christ had completely disappeared in the essence of the *Logos*—that his human nature was absorbed by his divine nature. This doctrine was at first admitted by an abbot called Eutyches, in 449, and condemned in a council at Constantinople, presided over by Flavian, patriarch of that city. But Eutyches had many partisans, who supported him with warmth, and propagated his doctrine. Another council was assembled at Ephesus in 451, in which, this time, Eutyches was justified, and Flavian condemned. It seems that great violence had been committed in the transactions of this council. The Pope, hearing of them, annulled its proceedings, and another was afterwards convoked, in 451, in Chalcedon. Here all the former decisions were declared null, and both doctrines at once, of Nestorius and Eutyches, annihilated by the clear, decisive, and imperative decisions of the council on the divine and human nature of Jesus Christ.

The heresies we have briefly analysed were all solemnly condemned; but their condemnation would have been of no avail had not the imperial arms lent their succour to the decisions of the councils, in order to banish them from the Roman empire. They found a refuge in the countries bordering on the imperial possessions. The doctrines of Nestorius and Eutyches, especially, were propagated in Syria, Armenia, Arabia, and Persia. In this last country, one of the kings founded a Nestorian bishopric, for the benefit of Christians—still existing, I believe. No doubt those doctrines, having traversed so many ages, must naturally have undergone many transformations; but they have always existed, and, although

subdivided into many more sects, they still exist, and still divide the Christian populations of the East.

Paganism was slowly expiring. It was perishing from neglect and through a peaceful decay, and along with it were disappearing the last vestiges of the literature and arts of antiquity. Although, during the fourth century, the celebrated writers of the period—Libanius, the Emperor Julian, and afterwards Proclus—were hostile to the Christian religion, nevertheless the profane literature fell into the hands of the Christians. The decadence lingered for ages in Greece. The East, it is true, during this long period, produced a great number of grammarians, compilers, chronologists, some of whom have left many excellent compilations and a few useful works—but no man of genius appears among them. In the West, the decline was rapid and complete. The Latin language was destined to perish. A few grammarians and historians form the feeble extremity of the chain of the Latin profane literature. Indeed, many of the Latin writers of that period were already Christians. Philosophy was imbued with Christianity in Salvian;—poetry, also, had become Christian in Prudentius, St. Ambrose, Sedulius, St. Prosper, Sidonius, Apollinaris, &c. But the antique Pagan form was insufficient for the Christian development. Christian art was to attain a higher perfection; yet, previous to its dawn on the horizon of History, the world was to be convulsed, and dark clouds were to extend over all the standards of a former age.

We have seen the theology of the gospel advancing and becoming the religion of the world; but the spirit of the gospel was very, very far, from being the ruling influence of mankind. The growth of its influence has been most unequal. It assumed a supreme dominion over the mind, while it held but a very imperfect control over the passions and affections. Heresy of opinion was a crime pursued with reckless fury, while the more baneful heresy of unchristian passions, which assume the language of Christianity, was general and uncontrolled. Such was Christianity in the dark and unreasoning ages; and although we shall see its progress through

the mighty drama of human activity, yet all must confess that, even in our time, we behold in Christian countries, with their various doctrines, too much of that rigidity in exacting the defined and admitted doctrines of *their* church, while the moral and practical sense remains insensible to its purer beauty, and to the working out of Christian influence upon life.

CHAPTER III.

Second Period.—The Empire of the East.—Causes of its Weakness.

—The Emperors of the East, from Arcadius to Justinian (408-527).—Justinian.—Military Expeditions of his Reign, against the Vandals, the Persians, the Avars, the Goths, the Bulgarians.

—The Successors of Justinian.—The Dynasty of Heraclius, to 718.—That of Leo the Iconoclast, to 802.—That of Michael I., to 867.—That of Basil the Macedonian, to 1057.—The Churches of the East and the West.—Theological Dissensions.—Influence of the Laws.—Italy, an instance of it.—Reformation of the Roman Jurisprudence.—The Code.—The Pandects.—The Byzantine Literature.—Architecture.—The Barbarian Kingdoms.—The Ostrogoths.—The Lombards.—The Visigoths.—The Burgundians.

—The Franks.—Clovis.—The Controversy on the Origin of France.—Death of Clovis (511).—Clotaire (558).—France reunited under Clotaire II. (613).—The Mayors of the Palace.—Charles Martel.—Laws of the Barbarians.—Their Influence.—M. Guizot.—Administration of the Barbarians.—The Judicial Duel.—The Ordeals.—Their Origin.—State of Europe.

A LARGE portion of the history of the empire of the East forms a natural transition between the history of the old Roman empire and that of the Middle Ages. After the military government of the Cæsars, Constantinople became the centre of a luxurious and powerless autocracy. The effeminacy and argumentative spirit of the Greeks had succeeded to the practical, martial activity of Rome. Although in the course of ages, which separate the epoch we are speaking of, from the fall of Constantinople in 1453, a great change took place in the manners, ideas, and the forms of government, yet, at the commencement, the difference was not very sensible. The successors of Theodosius long followed the path marked out by that great man. The transformation of the Eastern society was gradual, and it gradually declined, until the state of Byzantium, although retaining the title of Roman

empire, had nothing but the name to recal to the mind the ancient metropolis of the world.

The *Eastern empire* is characterised by singularly unique features. The state had grown out of fortuitous circumstances. All the ancient traditions among the people had disappeared; a new faith had replaced them. There were no national traditions of any kind even; for it was neither Rome nor Greece. The empire of the East possessed neither the power nor the energy required to discover and understand the new end of activity introduced by Christian ideas, and still the nation was Christian, and underwent many modifications under the influence of the morality of Jesus Christ. This society, without an end, void of a will, tottering at every external commotion, void of all activity, merely continued to exist because it found itself led by an established authority. Hence, no progress in the intellectual domain, or in the fine arts; hence, also, the manners and civil laws, tending to put aside the ancient customs and to ameliorate the social state, advanced with languor. The frivolous nature of the Greek mind since the days of Alexandria, the general fondness for subtle cavilling and mean details, prevailed; and left in the shade the lofty and broad features of the principles of Christianity, with its practical grandeur. In one word, the religious and political life of the empire of the East, or Greek empire, or Lower empire, as it is also called, was null.

Arcadius had inherited Asia, Egypt, Greece, and the provinces of the North. His weakness and inexperience rendered him incapable of fulfilling any of the duties of government; and, at first, Rufinus, his minister, both cruel and avaricious, his favourite eunuch, Eutropius, and afterwards the Empress Eudoxia, reigned in his name. Her pompous luxury and pride roused the indignation of St. Chrysostom, the most revered of the Greek fathers, and his courage in stigmatising them brought upon him the persecutions and dark vengeance of a worthless court: the holy and learned man, although deeply beloved by the people, died in exile. After Arcadius (408), his son, Theodosius II., remained under the guardian-

ship of his sister, Pulcheria, the first female publicly acknowledged as regent of the Roman empire; her wise and firm administration was very beneficial to the empire. On the decease of her brother she married Marcian, a worthy senator of Constantinople, who found the means of turning off from the East the tide of the barbarian invasion.

The custom of Roman imperial election still existed. No hereditary order was acknowledged; and either the nobility or the army, the most powerful of the two at the time, disposed of the empire. At the death of Marcian (457), the patrician Aspar, who derived popularity and power from his immense treasures, and his formidable barbarian guard, recommended the obscure name of Leo of Thrace, steward of his household. Leo was unanimously proclaimed emperor by the senate. His temperate firmness soon resisted the oppression of his benefactor, and he afterwards delivered himself from that ignominious servitude. He evinced a consciousness of his duties and of his prerogative, and resolved to extirpate the tyranny of the Vandals. His expedition, however, was unfortunate, and has left a cloud of gloom over his reign. His successor's (Zeno's) reign (474-491) was filled by his struggles with a dangerous rebellion and court intrigues. The great historical events of this period do not take place, as we have seen, in the East, but in Rome, where the last Western emperor lay prostrate at the feet of a Northern conqueror.

The widow of Zeno gave her hand and the imperial title to Anastasius, an aged domestic of the palace, who survived his elevation above twenty-seven years (491-518), during which long reign the internal agitations of the empire never ceased. Constantinople and the East were distracted by the factions of the Circus. The bloody spectacle of the gladiators existed no longer, but chariot racing had become the object of a new and furious passion. The drivers and their party had adopted colours, *blue* and *green*, which became the standard of political and religious factions. In one instance, the *greens* treacherously massacred three thousand of their *blue* adversaries. From the capital, this fury was diffused into the

provinces and cities of the East, and the two irreconcilable factions shook the foundations of a feeble government.

After Anastasius, a Dacian peasant, a soldier of fortune, who had become commander of the guards, was invested with the purple. Justin owes his celebrity chiefly to his having adopted the talents and ambition of his nephew Justinian, as the heir of his private fortune, and at length of the Eastern empire.

Justinian governed the empire thirty-eight years and seven months (527-565). His reign is pregnant with a multiplicity of events which excite the attention by their number, variety, and importance. Although weak in his private life, and subdued by the ascendancy of Theodora, whom he raised to the imperial throne from the most abject state of degradation and profligacy, Justinian possessed, nevertheless, the energy and laudable ambition of leaving a trace of his passage on earth; and it may be said to his glory, that he accomplished all that could be done for his time, and in the circumstances in which he found himself. We must relate briefly the military expeditions of his reign, before we proceed to the theological divisions and the reforms of the code of Roman laws during this period.

We have stated that the Vandals, with their king, Genseric, being invited to Africa by Count Boniface, had wrested that province from the Roman empire of the West. With them reigned the Christianity of Arius. The successors of Genseric consolidated the Vandal domination. The Vandals had been the most barbarous of all the conquerors of that period; the incomplete Christianity of Arius had exercised no influence over them. Their organisation, purely military, had no written laws, and already a large portion of the Moorish population of the country had rendered themselves independent. One of the Vandal kings of Africa had commenced hostilities with the Ostrogoths of Italy, after having secured the alliance and friendship of Justinian; but the Vandals, jealous of the Catholic influence, resisted his polity, and Gelimer usurped the government. Then Justinian had recourse to arms. A

brilliant expedition was prepared ; Belisarius was appointed to conduct the African war. He successfully reached that country with his army, defeated Gelimer in two battles, reduced the whole of the African province, and returned triumphantly to Constantinople (530).

A more formidable foe was threatening the empire on the East. Persia, since the third century, was governed by the princes of the Sassanian race ; and with them had commenced a period of military glory, with the revival of the national traditions and native literature. The religion and doctrine of Zoroaster had established its sway. Ctesiphon was the capital of the empire, only separated by the Tigris from another great city, Seleucia. The Persian empire often varied in its vast dimensions, but it sometimes extended from the Indus to the Mediterranean Sea ; often it made the Roman world tremble. The great historical events of the history of Persia can only interest us as far as they are related with Constantinople. The Roman empire was generally the victim of the transient greatness of that nation. Sapor, the second of the Sassanian race, had defeated and taken prisoner the Emperor Valerian in 260, and conquered the whole of Syria. Narses, the fifth successor of Sapor, had totally overthrown the rash Galerius in Mesopotamia (296) ; in the following year, however, the Cæsar who had been cruelly humbled by Diocletian for his defeat, repaired by a brilliant victory his former disaster. But Sapor II. filled his long reign with the most fortunate expeditions against the Roman possessions. During his war with the Emperor Constantius, he gained the great battle of Singara (348) ; afterwards Julian perished in an expedition against him ; and Jovian was reduced to a disadvantageous peace, which lasted without any material interruption till the reign of Anastasius. An invasion of the White Huns, hordes of Tartars, similar to the western invasions, combined with internal dissensions, threw for a while great discord among the Persians. Kobad, however, raised the Persian power and greatness, the effects of which were felt by the Emperors Anastasius and Justin. He was succeeded by his son, the

great *Noushirvan*, or Chosroes (Khosru), who was no less celebrated for his military exploits than for his equity, his benevolence, and his learning. The war broke out three times between the Persian hero and Justinian; at one moment the whole of Syria was in the power of the Persians. Belisarius was called to the defence of the East, and at the head of an army without pay or discipline he saved the Roman empire. After long negociations, and many years of fruitless desolation, a final peace was made, by which Justinian kept all his provinces, but engaged himself to pay a tribute (561). The splendour of the Sassanian princes shone again and again during the numerous wars that broke out with the successors of Justinian. Chosroes II. Purviz, above all, after having subdued an internal revolt, had a period of prosperity fatal to the Roman arms; but anarchy and revolutions came to shake the Persian throne. In 636, a Mohammedan army entered Persia; the Persians were annihilated, and that country has ever since professed the Mohammedan religion.

The Eastern empire had also many neighbours, who, although without much importance at the time of Justinian, became afterwards formidable foes. We may place here their very brief history.

The numerous Tartar hordes of the Caspian Sea had felt the echo of the great emigration of the Germanic races; they successively rushed upon the West. On one side they threw themselves on the Slavonian tribes, that now covered the east of Germany; on the other, they invaded the Byzantine provinces, where they met with but a very feeble resistance, and carried on long and disastrous wars. The two greatest and most lasting of those Tartar tribes were the Avars and the Bulgarians.

The Avars came from the plains along the Volga, and during the reign of Justinian appeared on the frontiers of the empire; they afterwards took possession of Pannonia (Hungary), and there established the basis of a powerful government. During the reign of Heraclius they advanced as far as Constantinople, and even plundered the suburbs of that

metropolis; from that time, however, begins their decadence. They had forced the Bulgarians to submission, but these revolted and separated themselves from the Avars. Several Slavonian tribes, moreover, established themselves on the banks of the Adriatic, proclaimed their independence, and became the founders of the principalities of Servia, Bosnia, Croatia, Esclavonia. The Avars, on the extension of the domination of the Franks, found themselves their neighbours on their western frontier; they were attacked by the colossal power of Charlemagne, forced from their entrenchments, and their domination was extinguished.

The Bulgarians came also from the banks of the Volga. Towards the end of the sixth century they were settled along the rivers Don and Dniester, and had some communications with the Eastern empire under Anastasius. Their hordes, more or less subjects of the Avars, were almost in a perpetual state of insurrection, and finally dispersed; some sought their fortune in Italy, and established themselves in the principality of Beneventum; others pitched their tents on the Pruth and the lower banks of the Danube; these alone remained long independent, and became gradually powerful and formidable after the fall of the Avars. They were divided in tribes, governed by a supreme *Khan*, and their aristocracy represented by a council of six great *Boyards*. Although frequently a prey to intestine dissensions among the tribes, they nevertheless remained long formidable to the emperors of Byzantium, and were only subdued and their kingdom destroyed by Basil II. (1015.)

Those wild tribes derived from the Huns their habits, manners, and perhaps their descent; they equalled them in ferocity. The blade of a sword was their sacred standard. Without mercy for the vanquished, their barbarity did not spare the women and children in their refinement of cruelty. Subsequently several of them embraced Christianity, more especially the Bulgarians. The Roman church endeavoured to civilise them, but their relations with Constantinople threw them chiefly in the Greek church and in numberless heresies,

which, during the Middle Ages, became among them the origin of sects notorious for their corruption.

We have seen the arms of the Emperor Justinian successful against the Vandals and the Persians. Belisarius had also conquered Italy, which for a time returned under the domination of the Roman empire. We shall see, however, presently, when we return to the history of the West, a new invasion—that of the Lombards (Longobards), followed by their formation of a kingdom in the north of Italy. The imperial possessions of Italy were governed by an *exarch* (governor), who resided at Ravenna. Rome, thus degraded to the second rank, first revolted from the Greek emperors on the occasion of the persecution for the worship of images. Ravenna was soon afterwards taken by the Lombards, and subsequently given to the Pope by Pepin. The southern provinces alone remained under the Greek sway till the arrival of the Normans; but the imperial authority was more nominal than effective, for all the cities had gradually obtained a Republican form of self-government.

After Justinian, the throne was successively occupied by Justin II., Tiberius, and Maurice. The latter was dethroned by Phocas, who was himself deposed and succeeded by Heraclius, under whose reign the Persian arms obtained great triumphs. Syria, Phœnicia, Judea, Egypt, had been conquered by Chosroes II. Heraclius, after three eventful expeditions in Persia, and an heroic war of six years, saw himself victorious in the heart of the country of his formidable enemy, and dictating a glorious peace. He also restored the frontiers of the empire on the side of the Avars as well as of Persia (627).

The latter years of the reign of Heraclius beheld the appearance of the powerful race destined to subdue the whole of the East. The Arabs conquered Syria and Egypt from the empire. This was not to be the limit of their conquests. They besieged Constantinople, and besieged it in vain during seven years (668); an obstinate resistance, assisted by the Greek fires then newly discovered, obliged them to retreat.

They were afterwards successfully attacked by the Greek emperors in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, who for a time shook the power of the Khalifat. But a spirit of conquest was far from animating the Greek empire; the normal state of Constantinople was resistance. After Heraclius, the Byzantine history merely consists in a tedious series of princes incessantly struggling with the internal revolts of the palace, the city factions, and the invasions of some barbarian tribes. The imperial palace at Constantinople continues to display an excess of luxurious ostentation, pompous ceremonies, a burlesque appearance of grandeur and vanity; while the empire itself is daily more degraded, and falls to ruin.

The Eastern throne, until the Crusades, was occupied by four dynasties, namely, that of Heraclius, composed of four emperors—Constantine III., Constans II., Constantine IV., and Justinian II., who, after several revolutions, was deposed and put to death, and replaced by Leo III. the Isaurian (718).

The dynasty of Leo, the celebrated Iconoclast; to which belong Constantine V., Leo IV., Constantine VI. The latter was murdered by order of his mother Irene, contemporary of Charlemagne; she reigned five years unpunished, when she was dethroned by the great treasurer Nicephorus, and exiled at Lesbos, where she lived in penury (802).

The third dynasty is that of Michael I., who accepted the purple when Nicephorus was slain by the Bulgarians. His successors were Leo V., Michael II., Theophilus, and Michael III., under whose reign took place the final separation of the Greek and Latin churches. Michael, odious to the whole empire, was murdered in the hour of intoxication and sleep, by the founder of a new dynasty—Basil, the Macedonian (867).

The dynasty of Basil occupied the throne nearly two hundred years. Among his successors are distinguished Leo VI. the philosopher, and Constantine VII.; Porphyrogenitus (born in the purple), celebrated for his learning, and who left several works. The reigns of Nicephorus II., Phocas, and John Zimiscees, form an interruption in the emperors of that dynasty. Isaac Comnenus succeeded this last prince of the house of

Basil (1057). When we attain the period of the Crusades, we shall find the Byzantine empire governed by the *Comneni*.

The church of the East was following a regular and peaceable course, whilst that of the West was upset by the invasion of the barbarians. A difference, however, was soon perceptible between the two. The church of Rome maintained her spiritual independence. Her submission to the emperor of the East soon became purely nominal, whilst the Eastern church was bending more and more under the imperial yoke. The mighty consequences of this difference are easily understood. The great principle of separation between the temporal and spiritual power formed itself in the West; hence the two camps—a Pope and a Cæsar. In the East, on the contrary, we behold a confusion of powers, nothing being clearly defined. The social edifice suffered from such a state of things. Sometimes the stagnation of the church checked the native activity of the people; sometimes the prince, being master of the church, made the spiritual dogmas serve his own selfish and interested views. The spirit and nature of the population, moreover, tended to separate the Latin from the Greek church. The Greeks were addicted to argumentative formalities; their zeal vented itself in words and vain disputes. Instead of converting new populations, they were losing their finest provinces. In the meantime Rome, with a concentrated, ardent zeal, was bringing the whole of Europe under her spiritual government.

We have named the principal heresies that disturbed the first ages of Christianity; they still existed, scattered all over Asia. The *Nestorians* had excited the Persians against the Greek empire. The *Eutychians*, known afterwards by the name of *Monophysites*, formed in Egypt the greater part of the population, where they received the denomination of *Jacobites*. The other heresies, although always maintained by sectaries, did not acquire any material importance in the social states. Justinian entered earnestly into the theological dissensions. His efforts to reconcile the Monophysites to the church led him into endless quarrels with Rome; finally,

the latter yielded to the imperial proposals of conciliation, and the fifth council of Constantinople, in 553, produced a temporary unity.

Towards the close of the reign of Heraclius, theological dissensions about the Monophysites broke out again. The emperor sanctioned dissenting propositions tending to a reconciliation. The whole Catholic church, deeply affected, resisted. The Pope was exiled, the Catholics persecuted, the emperors estranged and obstinate. Finally an understanding took place between the church of Rome and the court of Constantinople; a sixth council, held in the Eastern metropolis (680), settled the difference by issuing peremptory decrees.

But soon after, another, and perhaps more formidable, division arose in Christendom. The sect of the Iconoclasts, or breakers of images, headed by the Emperor Leo, the Isaurian, spurned and proscribed the use and existence of religious pictures. Probably the Jews and Arabs had inspired the martial peasant, Leo, with a hatred of images. The persecutions and struggles commenced; the Iconoclasts were supported by the zeal and despotism of six emperors, and the East and West were involved in a noisy conflict of one hundred and twenty years. The imperial will triumphed in the East; but Rome and the Pope courageously resisted. The devastations of the monuments of the Christian art, tortures and threatening clamours, did not shake their faith; they contributed greatly, no doubt, to the final separation of Rome from the East, although in 842 the Emperor Michael declared himself solemnly in favour of the images.

We have seen that the ties between the Eastern and Western church had been growing daily feebler. During the Iconoclastic hostilities the Greek emperors had wrested from the successors of St. Peter the Calabrian estates and the Illyrian diocese, which were not restored to them along with the power of worshipping images. Rome and Constantinople were alienated from each other by an hostile opposition of seventy years. The difference of language and manners had perpetuated the enmity of the two capitals. The Byzan-

tine court, moreover, had betrayed its impotence as well as its tyranny, and would have been but a very frail protector to Rome. The Popes, therefore, consummated the final separation of the Eternal city and of Italy, by the translation of the empire to Charlemagne.

We now proceed to say a few words on the Roman Law. The most paramount conviction that can be derived from the study of history is, that the form of government is a pre-eminent cause of the character of nations. The laws and institutions of a people are working agencies actuating their virtues or their vices,—their energy or degradation,—their enlightenment or ignorance. The influences of climate, the peculiarities of races, are but secondary causes. God has given all to all; and the governments which, either by craftiness, brutal force, or fortuitous circumstances, keep under their sway a society of men, either foster and preserve, or annihilate, the virtues and qualities which form the sacred inheritance of the human race. See Italy, for instance, how intimately in her history the causes are linked to the effects. The Italians have ever had the same soil—the same blood—the same climate; a few foreign hordes merged among them could not affect their nature and character; yet how brave and austere during the Roman Republic! how corrupt during their last emperors! how barbarous and ignorant when under the Lombards! how virtuous during the twelfth century! how splendidly enlightened during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries! how degraded again in modern times! But we now behold their efforts towards a regeneration; and when the genial sun of liberty shines on them again, a new epoch of well-being and dignified progress will commence for that beauteous and unfortunate peninsula.

Whilst the history of the products of a country and of division of property, and all economical investigations, initiate the student into the moral state of a country, or of a period (for property is the main, solid basis of morality), the history of the laws and institutions offers the other great feature of civilisation, the knowledge of which can be completed by the study of

the intellectual culture. All the great and various events of history are produced or affected by the feelings, characters, and exigencies of those for whom the laws are enacted ; thus the student of English history, who contents himself with a list of kings and the accounts of battles, only possesses a skeleton of history ; to understand the vital part of it he must turn to the laws, to economical questions, and manners of the nation, and to those very rare histories that comprise a real and entire account of all the agencies that contribute to civilisation.

The reformation of the Roman jurisprudence in the Eastern empire has had a great celebrity in the history of civilisation. Without it, no doubt, the Roman law and the remaining labours of the great jurisconsults of the age of Antonine could not have been preserved. In the space of ten centuries, the infinite variety of laws and legal opinions had filled many thousand volumes which no fortune could purchase, and no capacity could digest. Justinian had the glory of achieving the Reformation of the Roman law, assisted by sages and legislators ; the *Code* honoured with his name, and the *Pandects*, have been his indisputable titles to the respect of posterity. At the time of the great Theodosius, the necessity of revising and abridging the numerous works on Roman law and the imperial constitutions was deeply felt. Theodosius II. was the first who made a collection of the imperial constitutions, which, known under the name of the Theodosian Code, contains the best information on the state of the empire in the fifth century. It was also in vigour in the West, especially in Gaul and Spain ; in the East, it was annulled by the legislative labours of Justinian.

The Code of Justinian is a revision of the ordinances of his predecessors, as they were contained, since the time of Hadrian, in the Gregorian and Theodosian codes, purged of the former errors and contradictions, with the exclusion of all that was obsolete or superfluous, and a selection of the most wise and salutary laws, best adapted to the practice of the tribunals and the use of the citizens.

The Pandects or Digest are an extract of the spirit of jurisprudence from the decisions and conjectures, the questions and disputes, of the Roman civilians. The work is a true digest of the Roman law, and was preceded by the publication of the elements called *Institutes*. It was composed in three years by a council of seventeen lawyers, with Tribonian, the learned and faithful friend of the emperor, at their head. They exercised an absolute jurisdiction over the works of their predecessors, and although having no claim to original composition, they displayed the indispensable virtues of a compiler—method, choice, and fidelity.

The science of law is the slow growth of time and experience, and the most recent authors naturally possess the advantages both of method and materials; but when monarchs become the preceptors of their subjects they are too interested in the eradication of any free principle, and the augmentation of their prerogatives. Thus, whatever praise is due to Justinian, it must not be forgotten that some of the loftiest and most sacred acts of the old Roman laws were corrupted and mutilated, or suppressed, by the hands of arbitrary power; the legitimate, legal reforms can only be the work of the delegates of a free people.

The legal reforms and compilations executed under the auspices of Justinian, however useful to subsequent organisations, and to history in general, could not be of any material benefit to the Roman empire. His government united the evils of liberty and servitude; the Romans were oppressed at the same time by the multiplicity of their laws and the arbitrary will of their master—singular dualism, which has been resisted by so many of the modern nations! We refer, for the details on the laws and administration under the reign of Justinian, to special works on the subject. The general principles of the Roman laws continued to exist, and only underwent some modifications during the progressive advancement of civilisation. From the sixth to the fourteenth century it was illustrated by the labours and comments of a great number of celebrated juriconsults. The Byzantine

legislation yielded on two essential points, especially, to the principles and influence of Christianity. In the first place, the institution of marriage, which, in the Code and Pandects was only directed by motives of justice and policy, assumed, in 911, a legal religious character, submitted to ecclesiastical rules, deriving a spiritual grace from the prayers of the faithful and the benediction of the priest. Secondly, domestic slavery disappeared gradually, and was replaced by serfdom. A charter was even granted to the serfs by the Emperor Manuel Comnenus (1143). However, the prisoners of war who were not Christians continued to be reduced to slavery.

The Greek literature continued to decline under the Greek emperors. A vast number of works, produced during this period, have been preserved, a very small number of which inspire interest. Theology was no longer illustrated by such men as the fathers of the first Christian ages. Philosophy had become a compound of hollow words. The physical sciences, geography, and medicine, had made no perceptible progress. Philology and history are the only two branches in which the Byzantine literature offers works of importance. Philology was ever a favourite object of study in Constantinople and the whole empire. Numerous compilations, commentaries, and lexicons, have saved from oblivion much valuable information, and many fragments of ancient authors. The works of the Patriarch Photius are a living monument of erudition and criticism. Two hundred and fourscore writers, historians, orators, philosophers, theologians, of whose works eighty are now lost, are reviewed by him; he abridges their narrative or doctrine, appreciates their style and character, and judges them with temperate freedom (857). Suidas, also, who must have flourished towards the year 1000, left a dictionary replete with invaluable information.

The historical works of the Byzantine period abound in chronicles, annals, special histories, and biographies. It was an age of chronological mania. The Byzantine annals form a continued whole, commencing with the historical labours of

Zonaras, whose work goes as far as the year 1118, continued by Nicetas, who brings the Byzantine history to 1206, afterwards by Nicephorus Gregorasto 1331, completed by Laonicus Chacondylus and anonymous writers from 1297 to 1568. Among the special histories are distinguished the works of Procopius, the historian of Justinian; of Agathias; of Nicephorus, of Brienne, historian of the Comneni; of the Princess Anna Comnena, biographer of her father Alexis; of John Ducas, author of a history of the fall of the empire. The miscellaneous works on history, statistics, administration, &c., are also numerous.

The fine arts were cultivated in the Greek empire. The devastation of the Ottomans, and, before them, the fury of the Iconoclasts, have destroyed most of the monuments of that period. The Christian art was to assume a new and special form, and the architecture called *Byzantine architecture* is the combination of the taste of the West with the Roman architecture since Constantine. Already, in the fourth century, the Christians attempted a new form, a new art, in construction, appropriate to their ideal of Christian worship, and the Cross is introduced in the general plans of churches and chapels. The new and special character of the Byzantine architects is the dome crowning the church, which represents a cross with equal branches. The church of St. Sophia, at Constantinople, constructed under Justinian, is the most striking specimen of that style of architecture, which was imitated by the Arabs, and, through them, became naturalised all over the East.

The Barbarian Kingdoms.—We have seen the extinction of the Roman empire of the West. Italy, Spain, a large portion of Gaul, the northern provinces of Africa, were in the hands of the barbarians, who had embraced, as stated before, the doctrine of Arius. The empire was devoid of unity; the Roman civilisation was expiring; and all those new nations that had established their domination over ruins had deserted the principle which alone could save the world. Arianism had made a kind of compromise with ancient man-

ners ; it impugned Christianity in its vitality and its morality. With Arianism, those new races, despite their freshness of life and their vigour, would have been incapable of accomplishing the object which the Christian religion prescribed to societies. None of those new kingdoms would have possessed any of the deeper elements of life and duration had Arianism triumphed. The Western world would have offered the same spectacle as the states founded by the Mohammedan arms—a perpetual decline—endless subdivisions and vicissitudes without object—destruction of all progress, and the annihilation of all social state. Pure Christianity, therefore, was in great danger. The Christian civilisation had then great need of a man like Constantine or Theodosius, at the head of an ardent, energetic, and simple race, animated by faith. Clovis and his Franks emerged from the woody banks of the Rhine, and seemed destined to accomplish, we may say, the restoration of Christianity.

We have seen the fall of the Western empire when Odoacer was proclaimed King of Italy ; but scarcely was he installed with his northern tribes on the conquered lands, than new hordes, equally odious to the natives of Italy, came to snatch his new conquest from his hands. The Ostrogoths were also Arians ; they had been obliged to follow Attila, and, after his defeat, had established themselves in Pannonia. They were now commanded by Theodoric, who had been educated with care at Constantinople as hostage. At the age of eighteen he had been restored to the Ostrogoths, who soon admired his valour and skill. The want of food and clothing obliged them to desert their Pannonian encampments, and, led by Theodoric, they advanced in the neighbourhood of the Byzantine court ; but the emperor of Constantinople turned skilfully the Gothic torrent towards Italy, and after a war of three years, followed by the capitulation and death of Odoacer, the royalty of Theodoric was proclaimed by the Goths, with the reluctant consent of the emperor of the East (493).

His reign of thirty-three years is memorable for its peace and prosperity ; he deservedly obtained the unanimous esteem

of his time. His government was a sort of continuation of the Roman empire ; he surrounded himself with Romans, and among them was Cassiodorus, one of the last Roman writers, and of whom a volume of public epistles, composed in the royal name, is still extant. Theodoric continued the Roman forms in his legislative work, *The Edict of Theodoric*, and endeavoured to submit to the same laws his old and new subjects. The Ostrogoths and their king were Arians ; and although Theodoric had evinced great toleration for all tenets at the commencement of his reign, when he felt himself firmly seated on the throne, and suspected the existence of some dangerous communications between the Catholics of Italy and the court of Constantinople, he began to persecute the Catholics. The learned and lofty Boethius was ignominiously put to death, and soon his ungrateful sovereign, after a life of virtue and glory, descended with shame and remorse into his grave (526).

After Theodoric, dissensions broke out between the Goths and Romans. His daughter Amalasuntha, who was Roman in manners and education, was entrusted with the young king, her brother. The Goths, dissatisfied, rebelled, and gave her a co-regent, who had her murdered. Justinian, who was then reigning at Constantinople, was coveting the conquest of Italy. He proclaimed himself the avenger of Amalasuntha, and then commenced a war which during twenty years spread ruin and desolation over Italy. During the first period of this war, the imperial armies, commanded by Belisarius, were constantly victorious ; but Belisarius being recalled, the Goths rose again, and re-organised themselves under Totila, who nearly recovered the whole country till the return of Belisarius. This general being recalled again, without being allowed to achieve the ruin of the Goths, whose maritime power was still very great, the eunuch Narses, sent from Constantinople, struck the last decisive blow on the Gothic domination. In vain the resistance of Tejas, successor of Totila, was desperate. The whole Gothic race was nearly exterminated (552).

Italy was thus for a short time annexed again to the em-

pire; Justinian re-established the *exarchate* of Ravenna, and this function was entrusted to Narses, under whom some military chiefs, *duces*, were governing the various districts. Italy, however, had attained the last degree of wretchedness, when another invasion assailed her.

The *Lombards* (Longobards) had advanced from the Elbe to the Danube, afterwards towards Pannonia, attacked and defeated the Gepidi, and continued to march southwards. Narses had enrolled them among his auxiliary troops, and afterwards forced them to retire towards the Alps. It seems that, displeased at the conduct and ingratitude of the court, he invited them to the conquest of Italy, when he was obliged to abandon his government. The Lombards, in about three years, conquered nearly the whole of the north of Italy. The Eastern empire merely preserved Ravenna, the coasts of Liguria, Rome, Naples, Calabria, and the extreme South; but the war was continued incessantly by the Lombards, and always successfully; it only ceased when Charlemagne subdued them.

The Lombards were also Arians, and their domination was still harsher than that of the Ostrogoths. Their constitution impeded the formation of a national spirit. Their king was merely a supreme chief of independent tribes. Every chief or duke waged war according to his fancy and ambition, and they all disregarded the royal authority. It was a partial feudalism. Alboin, their king, was murdered (563); his son only reigned eighteen months, after which the thirty Lombard dukes governed and oppressed Italy during ten years, without a king. They finally elected the legitimate successor, Autharis, and from that day royalty continued among them until their submission to the Franks. During that period, the history of the Lombards is filled by their internal dissensions, their wars with the Byzantine empire—wars of succession—but also by a great progress in their laws. In the meantime, they were gradually converting themselves to the Catholic church, but it was a partial conversion—half Pagan, half Christian—and they remained hostile to the Pope. Rome, as we have stated, with her first bishop of Christendom, had de-

clared herself independent of Constantinople; Pope Gregory III. excommunicated even the Emperor Leo (732). The political influence of Rome, which, with part of the Byzantine territory, formed an independent state, had assumed latterly additional importance, and excited the jealousy and ambition of the Lombards. The Popes, unable to resist, had recourse to the Franks, as it will be seen elsewhere.

At the time of the great invasion of Gaul we have seen that the Suevi, Alani and Vandals fell upon Spain, and soon after the Visigoths took possession of the north of that country. The Vandals crossed over to Africa. The Alani were subdued on the arrival of the Visigoths. As for the kingdom of the Suevi, its duration was longer, but ended by its fusion with that of the Visigoths, who alone established their domination on a firm footing. Adolphus, son of Alaric, occupied the regions at the north and south of the Pyrenees (414); he was assassinated as well as his successor. Under Wallia (419) the Visigoths extended their conquest in Aquitaine, fixed the limits of their kingdom, and established their royal residence at Toulouse. Theodoric I., son of Wallia, joined the Roman armies against Attila, and perished at the battle of Châlons. After him Theodoric II. and Euric reigned with glory. The latter extended the conquests of the Visigoths in Spain, took advantage of the dissensions and weakness of the last period of the Roman domination in Gaul, occupied all the lands between the Loire and the Rhone, and laid the first foundation of the laws of the Visigoths completed by his successors.

The Visigoths were oppressive over the conquered populations; they seized two-thirds of their property; they, also, were Arians. When, therefore, their Catholic subjects felt themselves strengthened by the sympathy and support of Clovis and his Franks, then masters of Gaul, the power of the Visigoths became very frail. They were exterminated by the Frankish king at the battle of Vouglé, where their sovereign, Alaric II., fell, and the whole race was thrust back over the Pyrenees. They kept in Gaul a small portion of their territories, with

the assistance of Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths; and this falling afterwards into the hands of the successor of Clovis, they were confined to Spain.

The *kingdom of the Visigoths* became afterwards a prey to wars of succession; during fifty years it was convulsed and ruined by internal dissensions. Finally, the king, Leuvigild, raised it from its prostration. He waged a successful war with the Byzantines, annihilated the Suevi, and was reduced to oppose and put to death his eldest son, who had become a Catholic, and had risen in arms against his father. His second son and successor, Reccared, accepted wholly the Catholic faith, and Arianism was banished from his dominions; nevertheless, the Gothic power never afterwards acquired any national activity or political strength. The influence of Arianism never completely disappeared, although the clergy took an important part in political affairs, and many important questions of government were decided in the numerous councils at Toledo. The Visigoths did not succeed in forming a strong national unity; the royal power being elective, and the military chiefs possessing an authority always increasing, were a great cause of the weakness of the state. After the death of Reccared, seventeen kings reigned in Spain in the course of 110 years, and then a single blow from the bold and adventurous Arabs sufficed to annihilate this Gothic monarchy (711).

The Visigoths, more than any of the barbarian nations, imitated the Roman laws and manners. Their laws were almost wholly composed of Roman texts, with commentaries on those texts; they form now a curious branch of study of the Roman laws. Even those laws, made especially for the Goths, borrowed their principles from Rome. Alaric II. had commenced the Visigothic code, which was finally completed in 688.

The *kingdom of the Burgundians* was not of long duration. At the commencement of the fourth century, they had established themselves in Gaul; they were not conspicuous in any way till the period when, under Guntherich, of the race of

the Visigoths, they extended their authority from the Alps to the Rhone and the Soane, and from the mountains of the Vosges down to Marseilles. But Arianism had also penetrated among them; and this tenet putting them in open hostility with their Roman subjects, became a pre-eminent cause of their ruin.

Gunderich was succeeded by his four sons, Gundobald at Lyons, Godesigilus at Lausanne, Chilperik II. at Geneva, and Gundemar I. at Vienna, on the Rhône. These last two were assassinated by Gundobald, who was aspiring at the sovereignty of the whole. Clotilda (Chlot-Hild), daughter of Chilperik, was the only one of their race who was left; she married Clovis (Chlod-Wig, illustrious warrior), king of the Franks. Clovis found sufficient reasons in his hatred for the murderers of Clotilda's parents, and in the aversion of the Franks for the Arians, to wage a furious war against the Burgundians. He formed a league with Gondesigilus against Gundobald. The latter being defeated took refuge in Avignon, sought at all price, and obtained, peace of the Franks; then collected all his means and efforts against his forsaken brother, who was killed, and then all the Burgundian kingdom was re-united into his hands; but its downfall soon followed under his son Sigismund, who was attacked, defeated, taken, and executed, by the Frankish king Clodomir. Sigismund was avenged by his brother Gundemar II., who, in his turn, caused the death of Clodomir; but he also was soon after assailed and destroyed by the superior forces of Clotaire I. and Childebert II. From that time Burgundy ceased to exist as a special nation (534).

The domination of the Burgundians weighed also very heavily on their Roman subjects. They had taken possession of half their gardens and houses, of two-thirds of their lands, of a third of their slaves. The hatred between the two parties was intensely kept up by the religious divisions. In vain some of the kings endeavoured, by legislative efforts, to effect some fusion among them. The causes of division were too deeply rooted. There are two Burgundian laws; one for the Bur-

gundians, the other for the Roman subjects, known under the title of *Responsum Papiani*.

The barbarian kingdoms, over which we have just passed rapidly, appeared but a short time in history. Their ephemeral existence was destitute of a principle and of an object. Had not the Roman empire found any other successor, probably the new civilisation would have perished in this conflict of laws and manners, and in the struggle between the rapacious selfish conquerors, and the cowardly, corrupt conquered. But it was not to be so; and while Arianism was the frail element of the erection of new and fragile kingdoms, rising for a moment over the ruins of the Roman empire, a new nationality was forming itself in Gaul—a nationality that seemed destined to save and propagate the purer Christianity.

The Romans had always understood the dangers that threatened them from the forests of Germany. They had pursued the Germans beyond the Rhine, and had endeavoured to deal with Germany as they had done with Gaul. The empire, at the time of its greatest prosperity, had failed in this enterprise; and the defeat of Varus, under Augustus, by the Teuton hero, *Arminor* (Arminius, *Hermann*), had finally arrested the Roman conquests. During many generations the banks of the Rhine were the scene of incessant warfare. Over and over again, Germanic bands came to spread terror in Gaul by their incursions and ravages; others were enrolled in the Roman armies as auxiliaries. However, about two centuries after the disaster of Varus, the Western Germans organised themselves in a confederation under the name of *Franks* (*Fraken*, *Franken*, the proud, the bold; the meaning of *free* and *sincere* assigned to this name is of much later date, as Mr. Augustin Thierry has clearly proved), and commenced a regular system of aggressions.

The Franks, it seems, were conducted by the heroic family of the Merovingians, among whom they in future selected their leaders. The Franks assumed among the Germans the ascendancy which formerly had distinguished the Swabians (*Schwabs*). Soon one of their tribe established itself in the

North of Belgium, between the Meuse and the Escaut; another tribe advanced between the Rhine and the Meuse. These two tribes, or groups, are distinguished by the name of *Salian* and *Ripuarian*. The social state of the Franks was no longer quite similar to that of the ancient Germans. The chiefs or kings of the Frankish tribes, all chosen in the same race, became naturally hereditary. Clovis, king or chief of the Salian Franks by inheritance, being full of ardour and impetuosity, resolved to conquer for himself a sovereignty similar to that of the other barbarian kings established in the provinces of the Roman empire. Clovis attacked and defeated the Roman general Syagrius, and took Soissons (486). He wished to pursue his course, but was stopped by the resistance of the confederation of the cities of Gaul. They were chiefly governed by their municipalities, in which the bishops held a high position. Many of the celebrated saints of the church of France, during this period, rendered the greatest social services. Among them stood conspicuous the last Latin poets of Gaul,—Sidonius Apollinarius, bishop of Clermont; Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers; and St. Avitus, who vainly endeavoured to convert the Burgundians. Paris opposed a strong resistance to the Franks. It is the first manifestation of the French metropolis in history. But the bishop of Gaul intervened, and opened negotiations with the king of the Franks. St. Remi, bishop of Rheims, was pre-eminent among them. They endeavoured to convert Clovis to Christianity. Owing to some reason or other he resisted; and it was only ten years after that he was baptised, at Rheims, with most of his soldiers (496). The king of the Franks, having conquered the North of Gaul, married Clotilda, whose gentle sollicitations in favour of Christianity had often moved deeply the barbarian chief. Finally, the legend says, that in a battle against the Alemanni, who had attacked the Ripuarian Franks, near Cologne, and seeing his men give way, he made a vow to worship the God of Clotilda if victory crowned his desperate efforts. He kept his word, and soon all the cities opened their gates to him. The

Roman legions passed into his service, and thus was laid the foundation of French nationality. A new state, a new empire, emerged from this mixture,—a Gallo-Germano-Roman France; France, which offers afterwards the greatest national unity in modern history.

A singular historical controversy respecting the Franks long divided the learned world, and we may say the nation. Were the Franks the conquerors of Gaul? If so, the French nobility considered themselves their descendants, and the legitimate proprietors of the country; whilst the people were the enthralled posterity of the Gauls. But the Abbé Dubos explained, with learned sagacity, how the Franks were not the conquerors of Gaul, but only of the Romans; because the cities of Gaul, with their municipalities, forming a federacy, formed, through the medium of their bishops, an alliance with the Frankish tribes, and voluntarily accepted Clovis for their king, in hatred of the Burgundians and Visigoths, who were Arians; they clung to the king of the Franks for the safety of Catholicism. The imposing authority of Montesquieu, and, in our time, of Augustin Thierry, gave, on the other hand, to the establishment of the Franks in Gaul, all the characters of a conquest. And the idea has prevailed so much, that when, in 1789, the French broke their odious chains, and humbled a degraded noblesse, the whole nation proclaimed the vindication of the oppressed, after fourteen hundred years of slavery—and the victory of the Gauls over the Franks. Certainly, this was carrying the question of races somewhat too far. The German Historians naturally exhibited, in reference to this question, all their learning and national pride; they maintained that the whole of modern civilisation emerged from the forests of Germany, and claimed, as exclusively their own, the great emperor of the West, Charlemagne (Karl der grosse).

The question of races must be put aside to make room for the great question of principles. The Frankish, Gallo-Roman elements early formed one whole. A marvellous fusion was almost immediately seen—the basis of French nationality. But

that phenomenon of unity, and that fusion, could not have taken place, no doubt, without a moral principle of union and activity. Pure Christianity and its propagation became evidently the object and the end of the new nationality, as well as of its chief and military power, the instrument and means that certainly were the most necessary at that time. That object, that end, are pre-eminently conspicuous throughout the French history, despite the changes of times and of ideas.

Clovis remained faithful to the principles he had accepted. The Romans were not deprived of their property. The Franks only seized the fiscal lands. Afterwards came the expeditions against the Burgundians and Visigoths, by which Clovis annexed Poitou and Auvergne to his kingdom. The people everywhere received him as a liberator. The bishops favoured him in every way. The emperor of the East gave him the title of Consul, a mere name then—a shadow, it is true, but nevertheless a token of amity, a tacit recognition of his sovereignty. He was meditating new conquests, for which he required, under his sole authority, all the military forces of the Franks, commanded by various chiefs. In this view, he delivered himself, often by perfidious and cruel means, of all the most distinguished leaders, and united all the Frankish tribes to the Salian Franks, especially the most important, the Ripuarian Franks, who were encamped between the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Moselle. But Clovis died before he could make any use of all the forces he had collected (511).

The government of Clovis had been purely military. He seemed only to be the chief who defended Christianity. At his death, the command and the royal lands were divided among his four sons; nevertheless, the unity of the state did not cease to exist. We cannot enter into the individual history of the sons and successors of Clovis: it may be divided into two parts; the one consisting of their mutual rivalries and ambition—the other of their acts, which bear a social, French, and national character. Their wars and crimes are characterised by all the ferocity of barbarism. They were insensible

to the ties of blood. In 558, Clotaire having caused his rebellious son to perish wretchedly, remained sole master of the whole kingdom of the Franks.

The sons of Clovis followed the steps of their father. They conquered Burgundy, a great part of Germany, comprising Thuringia. Bavaria acknowledged the laws of France, and it is not precisely known at what period this new acquisition was made. The Visigoths, who were persecuting the Catholics, were again attacked, and lost another portion of their territory. In short, when Clotaire became sole possessor of the crown, France comprised nearly the whole of her present territory, with the addition of Switzerland, a large portion of Germany, and the regions at the north of the Rhine.

The death of Clotaire, who reigned only three years, was followed by new territorial divisions and new civil wars more disastrous than the preceding ones. The national sentiment remained among the masses of the people; but the military forces lost their vigour and the prestige of conquest. Of the four sons of Clotaire—Charibert obtained Paris; Gontran, Orleans and Burgundy; Sigebert, Austrasia (Eastern Franks, *Metz*); and Chilperic, Soissons. Atrocious dissensions broke out between the two last, or rather their wives, Brunehaut and Fredegonde, both equally celebrated for their corruption and infamies. After a series of warfare—of murders and treacheries, Clotaire II., son of Chilperic and Fredegonde, inherited Soissons and Neustria (Western Franks); and was afterwards called to the succession of Austrasia, where the government and regency of Old Brunehaut had grown hateful. Clotaire had her seized and quartered. In 613 the whole kingdom of the Franks was once more united in his hands.

Clotaire II. reigned till 628. After him the activity of the French nation seems to have been slumbering or exhausted. A race of corrupt, slothful kings disgraced the throne. Fortunately the Austrasians had preserved the primitive vigour of their fathers, and produced a race of heroes who, under the title of mayors of the palace (stewards), saved the monarchy from

impending ruin. They became the real kings of France. After endless divisions and wars between Austrasia and Neustria and their mayors, in which the bishops never abandoned the cause of civilisation and of unity, the Austrasians triumphed; their mayor of the palace, Pepin Heristal, defeated the Neustrians at the battle of Testry (687), and assumed the government of the whole of France, which he ruled with wisdom and with a profound policy during thirty years, in the name of the Merovingian shadows, confined in their solitary dwellings. After him his son, Charles Martel, continued to govern in the same capacity: he raised the kingdom of the Franks to its native grandeur; he pursued the original end and object of the nation; he saved Christianity from the mighty grasp of the Saracens.—We will return to this subject in the next Chapter.

A few Words on the Laws of the Barbarians.—What was the influence of the manners and institutions of the barbarians on the population of the Roman world? Were they one of the essential conditions of modern civilisation? or were they of insignificant value, and effaced by the natural effects of progress? Several historians have considered the invasion of the barbarians as a cause of immediate transformation in the whole social state of the provinces; they have even given a Germanic character to the social state of the Middle Ages, and to some of the events of modern times. In France, M. Guizot has proclaimed that modern civilisation was the result of three combined elements; namely, that the Roman institutions had introduced elements of order and government, that Christianity had given the principles of religious morality, and the Germanic manners introduced civil liberty.

Certainly, some of the customs of the Middle Ages can be traced in the Germanic laws; nevertheless, the barbarian laws are not very significant: most of them consist in penal measures; and in all, the political and civil right holds but an accessory, secondary rank. The barbarian laws we allude to are:—1. The laws of the Franks of the time of Clovis and his sons; 2. Those of the Alemanni, Bavarians, Saxons,

Angles, Thuringians; 3. The *Capitularia* (regulations or ordinances), most of which belong to the time of Charlemagne; 4. The laws of the Anglo-Saxon kings of Great Britain; 5. The *Formulas*, consisting of a mass of compilations of all ages! Now, when we compare the laws of the barbarians to the laws of the Roman empire, we find that most of the institutions attributed to the conquerors were already those of the conquered; we see the barbarians adopt the political constitution, the military and municipal organisations, the dignities and rights of property, then existing. They seemed more especially attentive to give new names to the same things; and that which more especially belongs to them are the customs particularly concerning the family, and some penal laws which the church had great difficulties in eradicating. In admitting even the Germanic element, as established by M. Guizot, but greatly modified, we must not omit the share of the influence of Christianity, greater, we believe, than the illustrious historian seems to admit.

The civilising principles of Christianity were paramount, in our opinion, in their influence. They engendered that admirable fusion between the Romans and barbarians; they caused that progress, of every kind, in every sphere of society, which, a few centuries later, was so striking; they softened the manners of those hordes of ruffians. The creative and perfecting power of the religious principle never ceased to be advancing. The civilisation of modern Europe is essentially Christian in its results, and in its promises for the future. Assuredly, M. Guizot's authority is deservedly revered, and by none with a more sincere reverence than by the writer of this volume; yet could it not be objected to him with reference to civil liberty emerging from Germany, that it may be also considered as the offspring of Christianity? The liberty of the German was great, undoubtedly, but it had something wild in its character: it was the liberty of lawless man, abandoned to all his impulses and passions; but modern liberty emerges also from another source; it has imbibed the evangelical sentiment of the fraternity of all, and accepted

from the same source the object of that liberty which is to give to each and to all the faculty of doing as much good as possible without permitting the possibility of doing evil.

Military authority became the ruling power of the conquerors. When it was established in all the provinces, this form of government found itself in perfect accordance with the ancient Roman manners. The great military governments were ruled by Dukes, and these governments subdivided into Cantons (*gauen*) commanded by Counts (*grafen*). All these divisions were equivalent to Roman functions. Most of the military chiefs were elective. Benefices (*beneficia*) were appended to the functions of officers and soldiers as in the camps at the frontiers during the empire. At this period also the military assemblies took a greater extension. This institution resembled at the same time the ancient assemblies of the Germanic tribes, and the military reviews of the empire. It was called Plaid (*placitum, mallus*). Every year, during the month of March, the army was convoked; then expeditions were announced and decided, administrative measures were taken. But under Charlemagne the Plaid assumed a very different character. It became, like the Councils, a veritable assembly of representatives, at once ecclesiastical and military. These assemblies were also re-produced on an inferior scale; each Count had, at regular periods, a private Plaid of the men of his canton; and extraordinary Plaids were held for the settlement of dissensions among the Franks.

Everything was subordinate to the martial functions. The distribution of the soil was in accordance with this principle. The greater part of the fiscal lands seized by the kings of the Franks had been converted into military benefices, in *fiefs* (*fe-od*), as they were later called. Then, those *fiefs* were not yet hereditary, and were transferred from one to the other for military services and vassalage. The lands free or independent of this service, which had been retained by the Romans, or acquired, with the same privileges, by the Franks, were distinguished by the name of Alodial, *alleux* (*all-odh*,

full property). Alodium, or, in its earlier form, *alodis*, is used for all hereditary land.

One of the principal results of the establishment of the barbarians was the application of various laws to persons inhabiting the same territory. Their laws were all personal, that is to say, they were only obligatory for the race that had called them forth. Thus, under the Merovingian kings, the Roman peasants were judged by the ancient Roman law; those of Burgundy, by the Roman law of the Burgundians; the Salian Franks, by the Salic law; the Burgundians, by the law of Gundobald, &c. A great confusion was naturally the consequence of this multiplicity of laws, and it lasted till the decline of the Carolingian empire.

The ancient manners of primitive nations, respecting the thralldom of woman, and the absolute authority of the father, are found in the barbarian laws. The laws on property kept the traces of that old Germanic spirit. There was no individual landed property; a district belonged to a tribe. The transmission of property remained surrounded by the old symbolic forms; a straw, the branch of a tree, were the signs of it. The judicial forms introduced by the barbarians were also striking. There was no social justice. When a man was killed, the family of the victim had a right of vengeance, and war alone could do justice—the force of arms alone decided any question of property, or any obligation. Among the Germans the right of vengeance was replaced by the custom of *composition*. They did not tolerate afterwards that warfare between families, and a composition was paid in money to the offended party, who then renounced the right of vengeance. Most of the barbarian laws have for their principal object the regulation of these compositions; all sorts of offences, wounds inflicted, are thus estimated; a value is even assigned to persons killed, according to their condition; and this is the singular valuation in the legal authority upon which the modern savants have chiefly endeavoured to determine the condition of the people at that period. Such was, however, the first germ of a judicial administra-

tion. The Count of each canton, assisted by the free men, assembled in a Plaid, had to decide in these trials, and apply the law. Nevertheless, the combat remained as a last proof—as a final appeal; hence the judicial duel, so frequent during the Middle Ages, and which has been found among the laws of the barbarians.

The church, it has often been said, endeavoured to replace this test by others less ferocious, although not more satisfactory, but which the ideas and manners of the time required; namely, the *ordeals*, the judgment of God, by which an individual was absolved, or gained his cause, if he could bear, without flinching, boiling water, red hot iron, &c., &c. But this assertion, so often repeated, is extremely erroneous, and nothing can be more unjust. The ordeal, no more than the duel, is derived from Christianity; they both existed long before, in the Germanic usages. It is the spirit of party that has accused the church of having devised these barbarous methods of discovering truth. Mr. Hallam observes, that during the *dark ages* they were sanctioned. On the other hand, the learned M. Ampère (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii.) gives a quotation from Agobard, who, in the reign of Louis the Debonair, wrote strongly against them.

Such was the state of Europe after the settlement of the barbarians. It cannot be expected that after such a cataclysm among the races of Europe, a positive progress could so soon be distinguished in the institutions and laws among nations that were scarcely formed. They were Christian nations, it is true, and although the path that Providence has assigned to them was now opened before them, yet they had many obstacles to encounter in their progress. At the period we have now reached, a mighty fact is nevertheless accomplished: pure Christianity is saved. The powerful and active nationality of the Franks exists. The other nations gradually constitute themselves, all animated by the same spirit, inspired by the same religion; they have only to proceed onwards.*

* See Appendix, No. II.

CHAPTER IV.

Second Period continued.—The Arabs.—Mohammed.—The Koran.—Mohammed's Successors.—The Ommeiyades.—The Abbassides.—The Mohammedan Civilisation contrasted with the Christian.—France.—The Carolingians.—Charles Martel.—His Death (741).—Pepin the Short, King (752).—His Death (768).—Charlemagne.—His Military Expeditions.—Crowned at Rome (800).—His Administrative Institutions.—His Death (814).—Partition of the Carolingian Empire.—Death of Louis the Debonair (840).—War between Lothaire and his Brothers.—Disastrous State of the Christian Nations.—Charles the Bald, Emperor (843).—His Death (877).—Louis the Stammerer.—Charles the Fat, Emperor (884).—Dissolution of the Carolingian Empire.—Formation of the Kingdoms of Germany, Italy, Burgundy, Navarre, Lorraine, and France.—Eudes.—Charles the Simple, King (898).—His Death (929).—Raoul.—Louis d'Outremer.—Hugh Capet, King of France (987).—Britain.—Conquest of the Saxons.—The Hephtharchy.—Egbert.—Alfred.—His Exploits, Virtues, and Administration.—Invasion of the Danes.—Canute, King of all England (1017).—Expulsion of the Danes.—Edward the Confessor.—Harold.—Battle of Hastings (1066).—Norman Influence.—Influence of Pontifical Rome.—Changes in the Church, Literature, and Fine Arts.—Second Period in the Christian Civilisation concluded.—Its Character.

ALTHOUGH we are especially studying the outlines of Christian civilisation, we cannot help turning an inquiring glance on a hero and his nation, who impressed a new character on so many nations of the globe. Mohammed and his Arabs erected their power over the ruins of Christianity and of Rome. The Christian world, for a time, was abashed by the splendour of Mohammedanism, and even seemed threatened with total destruction.

The Arabs, propagators of the new doctrine, were a rude, simple nation, divided into numerous independent tribes. They

traced their descent from the patriarch Abraham, and professed a mixed religion, compounded of Judaism and idolatry. Mecca was their holy city, where the venerated temple, with the celebrated black stone, the *caabah*, was the object of rich donations from the crowd of pilgrims. Each tribe of Arabs, in the midst of its pastoral wandering life, had poets celebrating their glory, and transmitting their deeds to posterity. However, Judaism and Christianity had penetrated into Arabia. It seems that many of their chiefs or kings had been zealous Jews. As to Christianity, it unfortunately sent among that primitive race its furious heresies. The Arabs first heard of Christianity through the fanatics belonging to the various doctrines that were then distracting the empire of the East. The Arabs certainly were in that state bespeaking readiness; a disposition to receive new doctrines. Their faith in idolatry was wavering, when Mohammed appeared. He was born at Mecca, in 571. His uncle was the chief of the richest and more celebrated tribe, and possessed a large fortune. Mohammed, gifted with a lofty and meditative genius, wrought in his soul the conviction that he was destined to effect the regeneration of his country; and he adopted the means most congenial to an ignorant and carnal generation. Mohammed was illiterate; but he must have been deeply impressed, indeed bewildered, by the heresies and disorders that were then reigning among the Christians, and which had found their way into Arabia. There could, therefore, be nothing very strange in Mohammed having misunderstood the whole Christian dogmas. Had it been otherwise, perhaps he would have embraced Christianity, and rendered Arabia a Christian country. The destinies of the East have, perhaps, been for twelve centuries totally changed, owing to the wretched quarrels of a few imperial pedants and narrow-minded fanatics. Mohammed, with the grandeur of his idea, felt that his first object must be to centralise Arabia, and that, to accomplish such an object, there was but one heroic means:—viz. to cut as deep as possible into the very root of all that which had been hitherto, justly or unjustly, a subject of dispute. With such

a race, at such a period, a religion was the simplest and most natural instrument.

Thus, Mohammed and his Arabs might have become Christians!—but, it is perhaps in the decrees of Providence that Mohammedanism should be in the East a point of transition between idolatry and Christianity. However it may be, we believe that one of the great features of the nineteenth century may be the conversion of the East to Christianity—although the Christians nations, putting aside their material progress, offer, as observed before, but a very imperfect expression of our Christian doctrines. The principles of Christ are more on the surface—in mere forms; their morality is but too often a mask. Modern Christianity, that has so often deprecated the propagation of the Koran by the sword, is blind to the ferocity of the Crusaders and to the iniquitous deeds of Christian arms in the nineteenth century in Africa, Circassia, and in India.

An indomitable martial spirit was in the nature of the Arabs, and that spirit would have been equally formidable if inflamed for any other cause; let us add, also, that they were driven to cut down implacable intolerance; you see that, even in our enlightened age, Christian intolerance and ambition persecute them; but let us hope that the day for the diffusion of the pure and loving spirit of Christianity is at hand, and that the faithful followers of Mohammed may become the most fervent and perhaps the best followers of Christ.*

We have stated that Mohammed and his martial followers were obliged to cut down intolerance, and we trust that most people are aware, in this age of enlightenment, that the Mohammedans were at all times more tolerant than the Christians, in practice especially; for it is well known that St. Paul proclaims all who are righteous to be the children of God; indeed, it is well ascertained that reconciliation between the Mohammedans and Christians is much more probable than between the various sects of Christendom. We cannot enter into an analysis of that *Koran*, or *reading* “thing to be read,” that famed book which by some has been read, it seems,

* See Appendix No. III. (a.)

70,000 times, nor of Mohammedanism ; but let us exhort all to reject with scorn all the turpitudes and calumnies that ignorance has accumulated on both, and which seem so rooted among a large portion of Christian communities. All religions have their legends, absurd traditions, and their popular fallacies, out of which the enlightened lover of truth seeks the moral and philosophical ideas and principles. These are the prominent features of the doctrine of Mohammed : and since intolerance is attributed chiefly to him, we may indulge in a digression, and quote one of the many similar passages in the Koran (ch. v. ver. 85)—“Thou shalt know that those who nourish the most violent hatred against the faithful are the Jews and the idolaters ; and that those who are the most disposed to love them are those men who call themselves Christians. It is because they have priests and monks who are men free from all pride” Fanaticism characterised especially the Ottomans, who were the successors of the Arabs, under whom the doctrines of Mohammed underwent many transformations. But we must return to the brief history of the hero-prophet.

Mohammed had been long brooding over his gigantic projects. He at first converted his family, afterwards a circle of friends. In the meantime several tribes were conspiring against him, and intended to murder him in his house at Mecca. Mohammed narrowly escaped, and fled to Medina, where a powerful party had declared in his favour. This flight is the Mohammedan era (Hegyra or *Hijra*, “Flight,” 16th July 622). At Medina he was joined by Omar and many brave followers ; they began to wage war against their foes, and to propagate the new doctrine.

On the second year of the Hegyra he gained the great battle of Bedr, celebrated in the annals of the Arabs. On the eighth year he entered triumphant at Mecca. Soon the whole of Arabia acknowledged his divine mission and sovereignty. When Mohammed died in 632 he had been present at twenty-seven military expeditions and nine battles. His father-in-law, Abu Bekr, succeeded him ; he received the dignity of khalif,

or *successor* of the prophet. In his time formidable armies of Mohammedans penetrated into Persia and Syria. He was succeeded by another faithful friend of the prophet, Omar, who subdued Egypt and part of Syria. Omar is celebrated for the destruction of the library at Alexandria: he was assassinated. A council of the principal Mohammedans elected the old Othman third khalif. The conquests of the Arabs continued; the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris were conquered; a formidable navy was formed. Othman being also murdered in 655, Ali, the cousin and son-in-law of Mohammed, and his first disciple, was elected khalif.

The election of Ali was the cause of a violent schism among the Mohammedans, and it still continues; one party, the Shiahs, maintaining that the three first khalifs were usurpers; and the other, the Surris, asserting their legitimate title to the khalifat. The Persians generally are Shiahs; the Turks and Arabs, Surris. Both classes exist in India; the common people are mostly of the Shiah, the learned and respectable of the Surri, sect. A war broke out between Ali and the governors of Syria and Egypt, Moawiyah and Amru. The hostile armies met at Siffin, on the banks of the Euphrates, and an indecisive contest occurred, which lasted 110 days, when negotiations for peace took place, during which Ali was killed at Kufa by an assassin (660). After the death of Ali, the seat of the khalifat was transferred to Damascus in Syria, and Arabia has since remained nominally subject to the khalifs, or to the Turkish emperors. Moawiyah being declared khalif in 660, he explored Asia Minor, and made Constantinople tremble. His successors were called Ommeiyades, from Ommeiyah, one of their ancestors.

Fourteen khalifs of the house of Ommeiyah reigned at Damascus during a period of seventy years, in which their sway was extended over Persia and Turkestan in one direction, and Africa and Spain in the other. The house of Abbas conspired against them; they took advantage of the hatred inspired by the race of the murderers of Ali. The revolt broke out, and all the Ommeiyades were slaughtered. One only escaped, who

went to Spain and founded the khalifat of Cordova. The reign of the Abbassides commenced. They made Persia the seat of their government, the capital of which was Bagdad (750). The Abbassides brought the khalifate to an unparalleled degree of splendour. Harun-al-Rashid, the fifth khalif, cotemporary of Charlemagne, is renowned in history and in fable. The science and literature of the Arabs were brilliantly cultivated. Industry and commerce were flourishing. This prosperity, however, was not to be of a long duration. Its decline commenced soon after. Al Mutassem had formed a Turkish guard, which soon disposed of the sovereignty. From the time of his death (838) the political authority of the khalifs declined, and their temporal authority was soon restricted to Bagdad and its vicinity. In the eleventh century the Seljuk Turks, who were recent converts to Islamism, invaded Persia, and made themselves masters of Bagdad and of the khalif. The Seljukian monarchs or sultans reigned prosperously till 1157, after which their authority declined, and the whole of Asia was broken up into a number of petty principalities. Finally came the great Mongolian invasion of Gengis Khan (Jangez Khan), whose grandson captured and demolished Bagdad, and put to death the thirty-seventh and last khalif of the house of Abbas (1258). Among the feudal principalities that were scattered in Asia previous to the Mongolian invasion, several had preserved their independence; among them the semi-Christian population of the Druzzi and Maronites in the mountains of Syria. In Persia, a Mohammedan sect, the Ismaelites, had formed an extensive state. A branch of them became celebrated during the crusades. Its chief, the Old Man of the Mountain, was surrounded by fanatical sectarians, who flew at his orders to murder his enemies, and the name of *Assassins*, which they bore, has remained a characteristic of their bloody fanaticism. Several Seljukian branches continued also to subsist; one especially reigned at Nicea. The crusaders attacked them without being able to destroy them. The last great dynasty in Asia before the arrival of the Mongols was that of the Ayoubites, which has

become celebrated by Saladin, the chivalric rival of Richard Cœur de Lion. One of their race passed into Egypt, where, after a gradual decline, the last of them was killed by the Mamelukes (slaves bought of the Mongols).

When the Christian states were in infancy, the fair flower of Islamism was in full bloom. The Arabs were rich in science and literature; their commerce prosperous; the court of their princes full of splendour; while Europe seemed still plunged in barbarism. Nevertheless, the sap of the Mohammedan civilisation was void of that vitality and of those principles which alone ensure eternal progress, and which are the glory of our Christian civilisation. On the other hand, it would be unjust not to acknowledge that the Catholic progress of the Middle Ages owes much to the Arabs.

The religious doctrine of Mohammed did not affect materially the poetry of the Arabs. Love, heroic deeds, ancient tales, were the subjects of their ditties. The literary progress was checked by the conquests of Islamism; but afterwards, under the Abbassides, poetry flourished with splendour, and after them a multitude of African, Asiatic and Spanish dynasties became celebrated for the protection they granted to literature. The fine arts were necessarily confined to special branches, as the Mohammedan religion forbade all images and figures; there could, therefore, be no scope for sculpture or painting. Architecture alone was perfected, although it did not evince any creative power or original invention; its principal features are borrowed; the dome is Byzantine, and the details taken from the Indus. The mosque is nothing more than a large room supported by pillars; no symbolic character manifested itself. The architects were more especially intent on the adorning of the princely dwellings. It was erroneously supposed that the Christian architecture of the Middle Ages was an imitation of the models of the Arabs, because, no doubt, they both had a common basis and similar elements, viz., the Byzantine architecture. But the Christian architecture transformed the Byzantine, and made of it an original creation, characterised by the dogmatic symbols of Christianity,

whilst the Arabs did nothing more than accumulate details without unity.

Greece and Syria were the cradles of the scientific activity of the Mohammedans. The Syrians, under the Abbassides, instructed the khalifs in grammar, rhetoric, and the sciences; numerous schools and academies were created; a variety of translations undertaken; a vast system of imitations took place. The philosophy of Aristotle was the only great system admitted among the Arabs; they applied some of its forms to their practical theology, which afterwards engendered several sects. The historical science of the Arabs became very rich after the ninth century. They produced abundance of excellent biographies, histories, chronicles, valuable sources for the history of the East, which have not been many years explored by the European orientalists and historians.

It is well known that the Arabs cultivated successfully mathematics, natural philosophy, medicine, and botany. In these, also, they were chiefly imitators of the Greeks. They, nevertheless, developed certain points of algebra—of trigonometry; they made new and judicious observations and additions in astronomy, geography, and medicine. But it must also be confessed that they neither had the presentiment, nor have been the harbingers of any of the great inventions which have placed modern civilisation so far above that of the ancients. They have merely improved the details of science, but discovered none of the fundamental solutions which have totally changed the scientific world.

Another very important feature in the civilisation of the Mohammedans is, that it only shed its light and advantages on a small part of the population. The princes and their court seemed the sole object of enlightenment. The people had no education, no instruction, and remained in ignorance and oppression. It was the same with reference to the advantages of their extensive commerce. The Mohammedans extended to an almost incredible degree their industry and their commercial intercourse with all the important points of the world. Nevertheless, this brilliant prosperity was not of long dura-

tion. Industry supplied with profusion all individual pleasures and luxuries. But all this wealth was confined to the court of princes and to a few commercial cities. The inferior classes remained in a wretched condition. Polygamy and poverty brought on corruption and depopulation. Now, those countries, formerly so flourishing and civilised, are a desert. Christianity will have to re-construct a social edifice over those ruins where her principles of regeneration and progress will penetrate and flourish.

We have left *France* in the mighty grasp of the Carolingians. Charles Martel, Pepin, and Charlemagne, are the great men whose intelligent efforts realised the unity of France. That unity made her grandeur and her power, and, supported by the church, it exercised its influence for the extension of Christianity. The whole of the civilisation of that period emanated from the church. The new dynasty felt that great advantages were to be derived from an intimate union with such a power. The Carolingians, therefore, created politically the unity of the church; they gave to the Popes the authority and the means for the general government of the ecclesiastical realm.

The authority of Pepin Heristal had been acknowledged by all the higher aristocracy. In dying, he left a grandchild and a natural son, Charles (Karl), surnamed afterwards *Martel* (the hammer). The latter had been imprisoned on account of his turbulent nature. Soon, Neustria rebelled, and drove away Heristal's grandson. Charles Martel escaped from his prison, fled to Austrasia, easily collected an army to march in Neustria, defeated all his enemies, and, leaving one of the last Merovingian imbeciles on the throne, he governed France with a hand as vigorous as that of his father Pepin (716).

Charles would probably have found great difficulties in preserving the integrity of the country, in rallying round him the whole nation, in order to resume the functions that seemed assigned to France; and his courage and genius might have been of no avail, had not an event of unparalleled importance placed him at the head of Christendom. The Arabs or

Saracens, masters of Asia, Africa, and Spain, assailed France, the last bulwark of Christendom. If their invasion had been followed by the same success that had hitherto crowned their arms, it would have been all over, perhaps, with Christian civilisation, with the morality of the Gospel, and with the social ameliorations that were to follow. Already, in 715, some Arabs had crossed the Pyrenees, and from that time had never ceased advancing in Aquitaine, then governed by the Duke Eudes (or Eudon), who had opposed the elevation of the Carolingians. Now, a huge mass of Arabs was approaching—the army of Eudes was victorious, according to several modern historians; nevertheless, the country was ravaged, the cities burnt. The Mohammedans returned, and victoriously encamped between Tours and Poitiers. Charles advanced with the flower of the chivalry of Christendom. A battle most bloody and gigantic was fought, it has been generally believed; but Sismondi and Michelet affirm that the slaughter was by no means immense, and think even that the Saracens retired without a decisive action: nevertheless the Saracen army returned to Spain, and the French ascendancy remained undisputed. Thus, Christian Europe, and the principles of progress and of true civilisation, were saved (732).

Charles had taken possession of Aquitaine at the death of Eudes, and repelled partial attacks from the Arabs, who had been called by the Burgundian nobles; he had seized Nîmes, Avignon, &c.; he had pacified France, and was negotiating with the Pope to protect him against the Lombards, when death carried him off suddenly (741).

He left two sons, Carloman and Pepin the Short (*le Bref*), whose government, as mayors of the palace, was, during several years, occupied by a desperate war with the dispossessed son of Eudes of Aquitaine, who had interested in his cause all the foes of the Franks; above all, the Bavarians, and the Saxons, who were still Pagans. Pepin triumphed over all; and in consequence of Carloman's renunciation of the world, and retirement to a convent, he remained sole mayor of the palace; and, ambitious to add the title of king to the power

which he had already enjoyed, proposed the question to Pope Zachary, whether he or Childeric was most worthy of the throne. Zachary, who had his own interest in view, decided that Pepin had the right to take the title of king; and the last Merovingian was confined to a monastery for life (751).

The efforts of Pepin for the propagation of Christianity, although necessary to his own greatness, and his successful wars, are his fair titles to the distinguished place he holds in history. He certainly prepared the great empire which Charlemagne was to raise to the pinnacle of glory. After several wars against the Arabs and Saxons, Pepin flew to the assistance of the Pope, and turned his arms against the Lombards, who had taken Ravenna, and were threatening Rome. His first campaign was not successful, owing to the treachery of the king of the Lombards; but he returned to Italy, chastised him severely, and made to the Holy See a donation of Rome, Ravenna, and a considerable territory: such were the first of the temporal possessions of the Pontiffs. Pepin afterwards carried on a successful war in Aquitaine, and died, after a glorious career, leaving the kingdom to his two sons, Charles and Carloman (768).

The two brothers divided the government of the kingdom; but by the death of Carloman, Charles soon found himself sole master of Pepin's dominions. Anxious for the unity of France, he put aside all the rights of the minor children of his brother, who were taken by their mother to her father, Dediderius (Didier), king of the Lombards (771). Now, Charles commenced that life of glorious deeds that have immortalised his name, and infused, as it were, with it the word *Great*. Charlemagne (Carolus Magnus—Karl der grosse), during more than forty years, fought for the Christian religion from the north to the south of Europe. France received under him an extension that has never been equalled since. Papacy and the Church, then the bulwark of civilisation against barbarism, were by him re-established on a firm basis; his activity was incessantly devoted to legislation, to the amelioration of manners, to the transformation of society; his

orders, commands, administration, were felt in everything and everywhere; the Councils and Plaids which assembled for some useful object, became extremely frequent. He encouraged public worship, imported a new church music, organised schools, formed scientific institutions, attended to details of grammar and language; in short, his powerful genius and incredible activity extended to all things. In every branch, every detail, he is seen in advance of the society he wished in vain to form and to govern; indeed so far, so much in advance was he, that there was no connecting link. Instead of being the progressive expression of his time, he was like a meteor that passed, caused terror and amazement without being understood, and without calling forth any sympathy. His efforts and genius were to European nations somewhat similar to galvanism applied to a dead body,—the apparent, convulsive vitality ceases, when the application of the phenomenon is withdrawn.

We can only name the numerous military expeditions of Charlemagne. His most important wars were those against the Saxons. The old Saxon league still existed; it was the centre of Germanic idolatry; its extermination ensured the security of the eastern frontiers of the kingdom, and the conversion to Christianity of very extensive regions. The war was long and bloody. Each campaign produced generally the same victories and the same treacheries. The king arrived with his army, and gained several battles; the Saxons submitted; but, as soon as the Franks had disappeared, they refused to fulfil the conditions agreed upon, and sprang to arms again. So it was with the expedition of 772—with the second of 775—with the third of 776. In 777, all the Saxon chiefs swore fidelity, and apparently became Christian; but their celebrated chief, Witikind, fled, and soon after a terrible and new revolt broke out. Charles vanquished them again, and again forgave. Another treason and revolt followed. This time, Charles, in an access of wrath, had about 5,000 of them slain in cold blood. This war lasted three years, and, Witikind being again defeated, a peace of eight

years succeeded. The last Saxon insurrection broke out in 798, and a warfare of six years followed again. Finally, they, with their chief, submitted earnestly, became faithful Christians, and Charlemagne granted them the same rights as those possessed by the military classes of France. In the meantime, the army of the Franks was constantly occupied on the northern and eastern frontier of Saxony against the Slavonians and the Danes, who proved very formidable neighbours.

In 774, Charlemagne had put a final period to the Lombard dominion in Italy, with the exception of the duchy of Beneventum, which remained inaccessible in the mountains of Southern Italy. Desiderius, king of the Lombards, had demanded of the Pope to acknowledge the sons of Carloman (nephews of Charlemagne) as kings of France. Upon his refusal, he invaded the territories of the church. Charlemagne marched upon Italy, defeated the Lombards, and assumed the title and authority of King of Lombardy. The fall of Desiderius led to that of his son-in-law, the duke of Bavaria. Bavaria being conquered, it was aggrandised by the annexation of the regions snatched from the Avars, whose empire was annihilated after several glorious campaigns of Charlemagne and his generals. The Mohammedans of the South, as well as the Pagans of the North, experienced also the power of the Carolingian arms. Several Arabian chiefs invited Charles to Spain; he crossed the Pyrenees, took Pampeluna, and advanced beyond the Ebro. He experienced a defeat on returning after the expedition. The population of the Pyrenees attacked the rear-guard in the defile of Roncevaux, and many Franks perished—among them, the far-famed Roland, the popular legendary hero of the Middle Ages. The countries between the Pyrenees and the Ebro were subjugated by France (778), but were re-taken by the Arabs fifteen years after; the war was renewed, and lasted, with scarcely any intermission, during the whole of his reign. However, Charlemagne had accomplished the greater part of his labours, when, in 800, apparently to restore the Papal au-

thority, he went to Rome, and on Christmas-day, whilst kneeling and praying in the church of St. Peter, the Pope, Leo II., placed on his head, in the name of Christendom, the crown of Emperor of the West. The empire of the West was revived, with the exception of Spain and Southern Italy; but many other nations, foreign to it three hundred years before, now formed a part of the Carolingian empire.

With this new dynasty of the Carolingians royalty assumed unlimited authority and unparalleled splendour. The sovereign was surrounded by a magnificent court, with all its hierarchy of dignities. Charlemagne had fixed his residence at *Aachen* (Aix-la-Chapelle), from whence he could watch over the newly-conquered provinces. This new metropolis was adorned with all the precious marbles of Ravenna and Italy. There, the emperor, surrounded by the most eminent men of the age, attended to the legislative reforms, or royal ordinances, promulgated every year, and known by the name of *Capitularies*: they were compiled in a body in 827, and form one of the most curious and valuable compounds in history.

One of the most important administrative institutions of Charlemagne was that of the *Missi Domini*, or Royal Envoys. They were persons invested with the royal confidence, who every year were sent into all the provinces of the empire, as bearers of the new laws; they held provincial Plaids, examined the administration of the courts or governors, and of all public functionaries; they received complaints, gathered all local information, and returned to the central authority, bringing the wishes, and claims, and grievances, from all quarters and extremities of the empire. Thus the mighty emperor was enabled to preserve a perfect order in his vast realm, and ensure that unity, which was the object of his policy.

The clergy had a great share in the beneficial results of the Carolingian administration. To the bishops were entrusted some of the highest political functions; they were generally sent as *Missi*; their activity manifested itself in every department, and they composed the ordinary Council of the emperor.

The ancient cities were still existing, and most of the municipal privileges had been preserved. In several of them, however, the administration was entrusted to the Count, who had Assistants (*Scabini*), appointed by the city, or freemen. The *Scabini* (*échevins*) were permanent assessors. The Counts had the command of the troops of the province, and made levies in stated numbers. Charlemagne bestowed great attention on commerce. He had his ships of war stationed at the mouths of all the large rivers: they guarded the empire from the sudden inroads of those hordes of bold Northmen who were already hovering round the regions which they contemplated as a future prey.

A custom which had previously existed, but which obtained great extension under Charlemagne, must be mentioned, as it must have contributed greatly in giving to the feudal system the character it assumed at a later period. It was the custom of immunities or exemptions, by which kings and princes granted to a certain territory or estate—generally to that of a church, or a bishop, a city, or even of a favoured family—the right of being exempt from the jurisdiction of the Count, which right naturally comprised many others; thus giving to the owner of that estate a sort of complete sovereignty—a very clear dawn of the future feudalism.

The empire founded by the genius of Charlemagne was, after him, broken up, owing to the personal ambition of his successors, to their incapacity and egotism, and also to the diverging, anti-pathetic elements of which it had been formed. That European unity—the dream of the great emperor, and of Charles V. in the sixteenth century, as well as of Napoleon in our time—was dissevered, then and afterwards, with a facility that has amazed the students of history of all countries. The truth is, however, that those martial legislators and civilisers forgot the very plain, simple truth, that real unity, and feelings of fraternity among nations, cannot have any other root than the practical working of the principles of Christianity, namely, the moral and intellectual progress of the people.

Charlemagne had three sons, whom he associated with himself in the empire. The two eldest, Charles and Pepin, died before him. Louis the Debonair (the pious), his third son, succeeded him in 814. Barnard, son of Pepin, was king of Italy. Louis was weak and bigotted; with him commenced a series of dramatic misfortunes, disastrous for the Carolingian empire. One of the first acts of his reign was the partition of his dominions among his children. To Pepin, his second son, he gave Aquitaine, the southern third of France; to Louis, the youngest, Bavaria; and he associated his eldest son, Lothaire, with himself in the government of the rest. Barnard, king of Italy, revolted against the partition; he was attacked, vanquished, and perished in a convent. The three princes, however, quarrelled among themselves, and agreed in nothing but in hostilities against their father. They commenced an open war against him, supported by Pope Gregory IV. The pretence was, that the emperor having a younger son, Charles the Bald, born to him after this partition of his States, he wished to provide him likewise with a share, and this could not be done but at the expense of his elder brothers. Louis was compelled to surrender himself to his rebellious children. They confined him to a monastery, where he remained in a wretched condition, till, on a new quarrel between the brothers, he escaped, appeared at the Plaid, or assembly, then taking place, and obliged his sons to submit. But misfortune had not given wisdom to the son of Charlemagne. The same grievances caused another revolt. The emperor was taken a second time, treated with more harshness, obliged to make public penance, and confined again to a monastery. Lothaire became the sole emperor; but his brothers' jealousy induced them to withdraw from his seclusion and restore again the old emperor, whose first act was again to augment the States of Charles the Bald. This time Louis of Germany (the Germanic), took up arms, and the war was renewed when Louis the Debonair died (840).

The civil war continued between the brothers. The anarchy was universal. Lothaire, emperor, claimed the pre-emi-

nence of the imperial authority. His brothers, Charles and Louis, united against him; and the sanguinary, gigantic battle of Fontanet (Fontenay), in 841, decided the destruction of the Carolingian edifice. Lothaire, being defeated, gave his consent to a new partition. The celebrated treaty of Verdun (843) regulated the claims of the brothers. Lothaire, with the title of emperor, kept Italy, with the territories of Lorraine (Lotharingia), Franche-Comté, Provence—in short, the long narrow space from the Mediterranean to the Northern Sea; his dominions thus separating those of his brothers, for to Louis was assigned the kingdom of Germany, and to Charles fell Western France, Neustria, and Aquitaine.

But those limits were not of long duration. From this time commences the most calamitous period in the history of Christian nations: dissensions, civil wars, usurpations, and revolts, succeed each other; the race of Charlemagne has lost all moral and physical energy; indeed, those calamities lasted till its complete extinction. To these evils are to be added the horrors of a double invasion of barbarians. On one hand, the Northmen (Normans), ferocious tribes from Scandinavia, arrive boldly by sea, on their frail embarkations, ascend the rivers, plunder, burn all on their passage, and withdraw loaded with booty, leaving behind them ruins and desolation. These fearful expeditions were renewed yearly, and the rivers of England and France expected periodically the singular fleet of those merciless depredators. On the other hand, a new Tartar nation, perhaps descendants of the Huns, whom they resembled in cruelty and physiognomy,—the Hungarians,—at first established themselves in Southern Russia. They fell upon ancient Pannonia, and their ravaging hordes advanced in Germany, Italy, and in France.

The degenerate posterity of Charlemagne could only repel the Norman invasions by disgraceful concessions. These concessions are the most important fact of the latter part of the ninth century. Louis the Germanic alone displayed some of the native energy of his race, in defending the northern frontier. The other sons of Louis the Debonair,

in the meantime, were entirely occupied in attempting to usurp the possessions of each other, and by their inextinguishable thirst for that title of emperor! Lothaire, after his death, left his states to his three sons, but these had no legitimate heirs, and, as they died, the ambitious Charles the Bald seized gradually their dominions, defrauding, with crafty skill, his brother, Louis the Germanic, of his share in the inheritance. Charles had previously been crowned king of Lorraine at Metz. In 875 he received the imperial crown from the hand of Pope John VIII., and afterwards was proclaimed king of the Lombards, at Milan. Louis the Germanic died at Frankfort in 876, leaving Bavaria to Carloman; Saxony and Thuringia to Louis; and Suabia to Charles the Fat. Their ambitious uncle, Charles the Bald, attempted new usurpations, but was defeated at Andernach; and returning from Italy, the all-grasping emperor died miserably, abandoned in the midst of a snow-storm, in a cottage at the foot of Mount Cenis, poisoned, it is supposed, by his physician (877). The pre-eminent act of the reign of Charles the Bald is the Capitulary of Kiersy, which rendered hereditary all estates, benefices, and the functions of dukes, counts, &c. It was the origin of feudalism.

His son, Louis the Stammerer, succeeded him without having the title of emperor, which remained unassumed till re-taken by Charles the Fat; who, when proclaimed, possessed Bavaria, Suabia, Saxony, and Italy, and as in 884 there only remained a posthumous child of Louis, five years old, all the nobles of France proclaimed Charles the Fat their king. Then the emperor found himself master of realms as extensive as those created by the genius and conquests of Charlemagne. But such a vast domination could only hasten his fall. During twenty years Neustria had only suffered partial inroads from the adventurers of the North. In 885 a formidable fleet, with 40,000 soldiers, ascended the Seine, and made the siege of Paris. The defence, conducted by Odo, or Eudes, and the Bishop Gozlier, was a series of heroic deeds. The intrepidity of all was boundless: it has remained eter-

nally memorable. Eudes baffled, day and night, all the storms. The Emperor Charles was expected with his Germans; at last he arrived; he encamped on Montmartre with his army; but, instead of aiding the intrepidity of Eudes and his Parisians, he purchased the retreat of the Normans, who raised the siege to carry their depredations in the provinces. The indignation and scorn at Charles the Fat became universal. The Germans deposed him solemnly at Tribur (887-888), and France was in the hands of Count Eudes.

We see the Carolingian empire finally dissevered. France and Germany are for ever separated (888); altogether, the various portions of this huge and fragile edifice formed themselves in seven kingdoms; each assuming its national characteristics:—

1st. *Germany*, where, after the deposition of the unworthy Charles the Fat, the Germans elected a sovereign purely German, and of the race of Charlemagne; it was Duke Arnulf, son of Carloman, and grandson of Louis the Germanic, to whom had been awarded the government of Carinthia. The reign of Arnulf was arduous, agitated, and wavering; he undertook several expeditions in Italy, followed by no important results, and was obliged to conclude with the Hungarians a very unsatisfactory peace. In 899 his son Lewis, a minor, succeeded him, and died very young; with him was extinguished the German branch of the Carolingian family. Then the German nobles elected a king taken from among themselves; they selected Conrad of Franconia, and with him commences the more strictly special history of Germany and a glorious period of that history.

2ndly. The *Kingdom of Italy* had been part of the empire of the coward Charles the Fat, and was left after his death a prey to factions and civil wars. Berenger, duke of Frioul, was afterwards acknowledged king of Italy. Guy, of Spoleto, assumed the same title, defeated Berenger, and left the crown to his son Lambert, who kept it till his death (898). Then the duke of Frioul resumed his pretensions, defeated the son

of Boso, of Burgundy, and remained master of Italy. In the meantime the Arabs and Hungarians were ravaging the south and north of Italy. In the meantime, also, the leprosy of immorality had penetrated everywhere in Italy. Papacy was only a corrupt instrument in the hands of the various factions. Berenger did not remain tranquil possessor of Italy. His enemies called Rodolph I., of the *transjuran* Burgundy, who had great chance of success after Berenger's death; but he gave up his pretensions to the throne of Italy to Hugues, marquis of Provence, in exchange for the *cisjuran* Burgundy. Hugues, after many struggles with another competitor, Berenger II., of Istria, succeeded in having his own son, Lothaire, crowned king of Italy, and left him. But on the demise of Lothaire, Berenger II. married his widow, Adelaide, and was by all parties acknowledged king of Italy (950). Adelaide, however, being, it is said, ill-treated, fled, called to her assistance Otto, of Germany, and, as a party had been already formed in Italy against Berenger II., the king of Germany took, easily, possession of the crown of the Lombards (961). From that period to the end of the Middle Ages Northern Italy remained united to Germany.

3rdly and 4thly.—The *Two Kingdoms of Burgundy*; the one, known by the denomination of *cisjuran*, comprising Franche-Comté, Chalons, Mâcon, Vienne, Lyon, part of Languedoc, and Provence. In 879 Count Boso seized the opportunity of the weakness of France to render himself independent in these states. The other comprised a part of Burgundy, Switzerland, and Savoy, where Rodolph had also made himself independent, and it was called the *transjuran* kingdom of Burgundy. The son of Boso remained under the absolute control of Hugues, marquis of Provence, and we have seen the exchange he made of the *cisjuran* Burgundy for Italy; thus Rodolph united the two Burgundies, which formed one sovereignty, under the name of the Capital, and was, therefore, called the Kingdom of Arles (933). Feudalism was reigning in this kingdom. The nobles and bishops were perfectly independent in their governments. Rodolph II. and his son

Conrad reigned afterwards, and, after them, Rodolph III., whose eldest sister was mother of Henry II. of Germany, whom he appointed as his successor; but Henry II. dying before him, on his own demise Conrad II., the new German king, also a relation of Rodolph III., but more distant than the Count Champagne and others, claimed the kingdom of Burgundy in virtue of ancient imperial rights; his arms ensured the triumph of his pretensions, and the kingdom of Arles became a part of the Germanic empire (1036).

5thly. The *Kingdom of Navarre*, at the foot of the Pyrenees, independent since 831.

6thly. The *Kingdom of Lorraine*, which separated itself from Germany in 895. The destinies and influence of these two minor nationalities are of too subaltern a nature to detain us; we shall have occasions of naming them subsequently. As to Bretany and Aquitaine, they were separately governed by their chiefs, who did not then take the title of king.

And 7thly. The *Kingdom of France*. Eudes, proclaimed king after his exploits on the walls of Paris by all the great vassals of the kingdom, beheld a party that rose against him, and upheld the claims of the posthumous child of Louis the Stammerer, Charles the Simple. Although Eudes, by a brilliant victory over the Normans, consolidated his authority in the north of France, nevertheless Charles remained a formidable rival, and, to prevent the horrors of civil war, he consented to a division of the kingdom with him. But Eudes did not long survive this partition; and a year after, Charles the Simple found himself king of the whole of France (898). The royal authority was annulled by that of the great vassals. A new, formidable, and last invasion of the Normans was threatening the realm. Resistance was vain. This time, their chief, Rollo, was offered an extensive territory in Neustria as fief, if he would embrace Christianity. The negotiation was carried on by the bishops. The Norman chief accepted, and received the hand of the daughter of the king of France. Rollo was the founder of *Normandy*. He changed the manners of his companions, gave them a taste for agriculture, order,

and industry, and established a wise and firm administration. Normandy was soon distinguished for her prosperity and opulence. Christianity and feudalism became rooted in that province, and there were first developed the language, poetry, and chivalrous manners of France.

The reign of Charles the Simple was not a peaceful one. He had a war with the Saxons (911-915), because he had accepted the homage of Lorraine; then with the king of Germany, Henry I., with whom he signed a treaty at Bonn (923). A rebellion broke out among the vassals, who placed at their head Robert, son of Eudes, assisted by Germany. A great battle was fought at Soissons (923), where Robert was killed. The rebellious vassals then offered the crown to Raoul, duke of Burgundy. Charles the Simple was betrayed by those nobles who accompanied him, and, loaded with chains, he was imprisoned at Peronne, where he died (929). Raoul, the Burgundian, remained king, in consequence of his concessions. At his death (936), a son of Charles the Simple, who had been taken to England by his mother, Louis IV., *d'Outremer*, was invited to France, and hailed king, by the unanimous suffrage of the nobles. But feudalism was more powerful than royalty. Hugh the Great, possessor of vast territories, assumed a dictatorial tone. The king, wishing to resist, a rebellion ensued: Otto, the king of Germany, reconciled them (942). Soon after, Louis, ambitious of the possession of Normandy, imprudently advanced into that country, was taken prisoner, given up to Hugh, delivered after many humiliations, and finally died, leaving to his son Lothaire, only thirteen years old, a crown that had lost the last ray of its former lustre. Hugh the Great gave him his support. The great fact in the reign of Lothaire was a war with Otto II. of Germany, during which the two kings took a rapid promenade on each other's dominions. It terminated by the treaty of Rheims, through which Lothaire lost Lorraine (980). Lothaire renewed afterwards a useless war with Germany, turned towards Aquitaine, and died in 986. His son, Louis V., succeeded him. But a dark cloud of obscurity covers the last

years of the Carolingian dynasty : a silence of terror seems to reign over that mysterious period. Hugh, surnamed *Capet*, son of Hugh the Great, was proclaimed king of France by all the nobles and bishops of the North, at Noyon (987). The last of the Carolingians disappeared.

Let us now turn to *Britain*. The importance of her history is but secondary during the first ages of Christianity. The Roman settlement formed in the island declined with the Roman power in the West. The Southern Britons recovered their liberty, but only to become the object of incessant predatory invasion from their Northern neighbours. They solicited the Saxons and the Angles of Germany for succour and protection. These came, compelled the Scots to retire to their mountains, but soon turned their thoughts to the entire reduction of the Britons. The whole of England was reduced under the Saxon government, after an obstinate contest of nearly one hundred and fifty years. Seven distinct provinces became as many independent kingdoms, called the Heptarchy. The government and manners of the Saxons were similar to those of all the ancient Germanic nations. Civilisation finally penetrated among them with Christianity. No doubt many conversions had taken place before the arrival of Augustine, but this monk, sent by Pope Gregory the Great, completed the efforts of the missionaries. All the Anglo-Saxons became Christians. After endless vicissitudes and warfare between the various sovereigns of the Heptarchy, Egbert, prince of the West Saxons, who had been partly trained at the court of Charlemagne, succeeded, by his victorious arms and judicious policy, in uniting together several of the separate states (827). But the reduction of all England under a single sovereign was accomplished by Edward the Elder.

In the meantime, under the auspices of Christianity, monasteries had been established, and with them schools and intellectual labours were promoted. Many laborious scholars distinguished themselves, and the greatest among them—one of the great luminaries of that period—Bede the Venerable, flourished at the end of the seventh century : he is celebrated

for his ecclesiastical history, and his extracts in every branch of science. Several of the Saxon kings had also promulgated written laws and developed their legislation; but England, partially united by Egbert, did not enjoy much tranquillity. The Normans, here known by their true name, *Danes*, had for fifty years desolated the English coasts, and continued to be a perpetual scourge to the country. Under Alfred, grandson of Egbert, they reduced the kingdom to extreme wretchedness. The heroic Alfred, in one year, defeated the Danes in eight battles. A new irruption forced him to solicit peace; he was compelled himself to seek his safety in an obscure quarter of the country, till the disorders of the Danish army offered a fair opportunity, which he improved, to the entire defeat of his enemies. Alfred, so justly surnamed the Great, united the most enterprising spirit with consummate prudence and moderation—the utmost vigour of authority with the most engaging gentleness of manner—the most exemplary justice with the greatest lenity;—he united the talents of the statesman and the man of letters—the piety of the true Christian with the intrepid resolution and conduct of the general. He found the kingdom in the most miserable conditions to which anarchy, domestic barbarism and foreign hostility could reduce it; he brought it to a pitch of eminence surpassing, in some respects, the situation of its contemporary nations. He organised the civil and military administration of the kingdom somewhat on the model of that of France. He instituted various courts of appeal, in order to have all disputes settled with justice, and the ultimate appeal from all lay to the king in council. He composed, for the regulation of these courts and of his kingdom, a body of laws, the basis of the common law of England.

Unfortunately, the noble, the great Alfred, had no worthy successor. After him, England became again a prey to the ravages of the Danes and intestine disorders—all became again confusion and barbarism. In 981, the kings of Denmark and Norway made a formidable descent on England, and forced Ethelred, the king of Britain, to pay a tribute.

The English nobility made a tender of the crown to the Danish monarch, whose son, Canute the Great, finally became king of all England (1017). Canute, sovereign of Denmark, Norway, and England, swayed for seventeen years the sceptre of England with a firm and vigorous hand. He left (1036) the English crown to Harold, one of his sons, a merciless tyrant, who died in the fourth year of his reign, and was succeeded by a son, who, after two years, died in consequence of the excesses of an orgy. The English seized this opportunity of shaking off the Danish yoke. They called to the throne a younger son of Ethelred, Edward the *Confessor*, who had been trained at the court of Normandy, and who reigned weakly and ingloriously for twenty-five years; on his death, Harold, son of Earl Godwin, who had secured a very formidable party in the kingdom, took possession of the throne. Edward, no doubt, had in the earlier part of his life promised to bequeath the English crown to William, duke of Normandy, but he had also on his death-bed pointed out his brother-in-law Harold as the most worthy to be his successor. Thus Harold felt himself the legitimate defender of the Anglo-Saxon race, and met valiantly the formidable armament of the duke of Normandy. His death, and the ruin of the Anglo-Saxons at the battle of Hastings (1066), placed William and his rapacious Normans in possession of England. From that day, it is true, this country entered into the political movement of the other Christian nations, and became connected with the European civilisation. It is equally true that continual wars, barbarian invasions, civil discords, had stifled all religious and intellectual activity in England, and that no new progress in the laws was manifest. But, on the other hand, why should the Norman conquest be considered as exclusively beneficial and civilising? It became so, owing to fortuitous circumstances. Why could not the Anglo-Saxon race, with the noble germs left by the great Alfred, have entered a career of progress and civilisation? All the lofty features and characteristics of the English nation—all the great deeds that have elevated England to unparalleled eminence and ascen-

dancy, bear an essentially Anglo-Saxon stamp. The Norman influence, therefore, should not be extolled beyond its natural limits.

At the period we have now reached in these outlines of Christian civilisation, every influence from antiquity and Pagan civilisation had disappeared. It is a time of violent struggles, when military influence was omnipotent, the calm labours of the intellect were neglected, and the first elements of a scientific and artistical re-construction are scarcely visible. The church, as said before, stood pre-eminent in all political movements; her history is the whole moral history of the time. The Papal authority had prodigiously augmented. St. Gregory the Great (590) manifested an indefatigable activity for the propagation of Christianity—a surpassing energy, blended with great Christian humility and austere manners. He was the first of Popes who called himself the Servant of the Servants of God, the Universal Bishop, and who took the title of Holiness. He took an active part in all the discussions with the patriarch of Constantinople, developed the liturgy, invented a modern musical system; he was an eloquent preacher, and cast a great lustre on the dignity of bishop of Rome. With the Carolingian kings, the conversion of Germany was completed, the spiritual authority of Rome extended. Under their auspices, the abuses and disorders of the church were reformed, and the Papal dignity, along with the temporal authority conferred by Charlemagne, finally constituted the great spiritual unity and supremacy of Christendom, acknowledged by all the churches of the West.

The successor of Charlemagne considered it as a right inherent in Papacy to crown the emperor. Charles the Bald recognised holding the empire from God through the Pope. Afterwards, the dissensions in Italy re-acted fatally on Papacy. The factions of the Roman nobility held this Christian dignity in thralldom; and afterwards the Holy See gave to the world the revolting spectacle of the grossest depravity. The pontifical throne only resumed its dignity when the kings of Germany aspired to the empire; it recovered then the prestige of

spiritual authority, but the Germanic emperors, after having contributed to this restoration, endeavoured to secure its influence exclusively to their own advantage; hence arose the virulent hostilities during the following period of the history of Christian Europe, between the imperial ambition and the pontifical pretensions.

The organisation of the church had experienced many minor changes. As the power of the Pope was constantly ascending, that of the bishops was descending. These lost also a great share of authority when, under Charlemagne, the institution of laymen advocates of the churches became general, authorised also to represent the church in the assemblies and to command their men-at-arms. They subsequently obtained hereditary incomes on their endowments to the church, and a right of superintendence in the ecclesiastical properties. The monastic institutions also, with the privileges they received, began to limit the episcopal authority. St. Benedict, in 543, founded the most austere, active, and enlightened monastic order. The convents were then the only schools and refuges of the true Christian spirit.* However, the intrusion of laymen in those institutions became a source of great corruption in the monastic discipline; and after Charlemagne, the government and revenues of monasteries were assigned indifferently to all classes of laymen. *Canonical* life, namely, religious life in common, had also been introduced in 760, and it formed a hierarchy, which could also counterbalance that of the bishop. Another important modification in the dioceses was the institution of ecclesiastical benefices, instead of the salary being distributed from the episcopal coffer. The possession of benefices, it is true, gave more independence to the inferior clergy, but it also engendered afterwards very great abuses. The church, in her efforts to moralise society, established a tribunal, held annually in every parish, for each to come and declare his sins. It was then, no doubt, the best mode of discipline for those immoral barbarians who formed the mass of the society of that period. The sinners were obliged to make penances,

* See Appendix, No. III. (b.)

and then was introduced the possibility of redeeming these penances with sums of money, but with disinterested views; this money being ostensibly designed for the poor. We have already alluded to the happy influence of the church in all judicial affairs. Charlemagne had laid the foundation of the civil jurisdiction of the church, which took so great an extension during the subsequent period of Christian civilisation. All ecclesiastical privileges were intended originally, and employed, to soften the native harshness of barbarian laws and manners, and for the protection of innocence.

The various changes in literature and the fine arts may be very briefly traced. The literary labours of the fathers of the church had replaced the Pagan literature; but the literature of the fathers disappeared also; Boetius and Cassiodorus were its last representatives. Afterwards, all taste for instruction and ancient literature was drowned in the commotions of warfare. The Latin language, growing daily more corrupt, lost gradually its primitive purity. At last, the rules of syntax were totally forgotten, and the most learned in the seventh century confessed not being very well acquainted with the various terminations of the verbs and nouns.

"The intellectual decline of Frankish Gaul," says M. Guizot (Twenty-second Lecture), "has been constant, general, from the fifth to the eighth century. It is the essential character of that period, and it only stopped at the reign of Charlemagne. . . . it is not to the triumph of the principle of authority and faith over the principle of liberty and reason, that the intellectual sterility of that period must be attributed (as supposed by M. Tennemann, in his *History of Philosophy*); the fall of the empire, its disorder and miseries, the dissolution of all social ties, the occupations and distress of individual interest, the impossibility of any long labour and peaceful leisure,—such were the true causes of the decline, moral as well as political, and of the darkness that fell over the human mind."

We have stated that the reign of Charlemagne was a period of literary and scientific revival, until about Charles the Bald,

whose intimate counsellor was the celebrated philosopher, Scotus Erigen, the most remarkable man of the dark ages, at once bold and subtle in his metaphysical speculations. Among the most distinguished men of that period, stand, above all, Alcuin, the Saxon philosopher; the theologian, Hincmarus, archbishop of Rheims; Paul Winfried Diaconus, the historian of the Lombards; Eginhart, historian, the intimate secretary of Charlemagne, &c. : all their intellectual labours, however, had no important results; no interest can be attached to a state of knowledge inferior to that of the Romans.

The progressive impulse of Christianity, on the other hand, manifested itself in the fine arts. Music and architecture were renovated. Architecture began to exhibit the dawn of the beautiful architecture of the Middle Ages. The style called Byzantine, offers, during this period, its best models. The statues, long and narrow, generally destined to be placed instead of columns, have nothing very remarkable; but the massive grandeur, the austere majesty, of almost all the churches, prepare the beauty of the Catholic art. Now the shape of the cross is perfectly fixed; the church is cleared from all the accessories it offered during the first ages; the distinctive character of the style is a great simplicity in ornaments; massive towers and a curve in the general construction. Mosaics adorn the walls, and although painting is in its infancy, yet the first rude essays are seen in many of the places of worship.

We have now reached the close of the second period of Christian civilisation, during which the progress is so incoherent, so wavering, all external appearances so rough, that the question might be fairly asked, Was there really any progress in civilisation during the ages we have already so rapidly explored? No doubt, ignorance, immorality, and the most brutal ferocity, have been foremost during the whole time; it is the driest epoch for the historian of facts as well as for the moral historian. But the human mind has not retrograded, although it certainly has the appearance of having done so. Civilisation does not describe a straight and continuous line:

it is, according to the simile of a great writer, like a ship that majestically emerges from the harbour ; she is afterwards assailed by a tempest ; she struggles with the furious waves, is obliged to retrace her steps, then darts again with the rapidity of an eagle, returns, pushed by the violence of a contrary gale ; nevertheless, by the skill of her pilot, a few steps are gained in spite of the obstacles of nature ; he ardently seizes the happy chance that brings favourable winds, and the ship finally arrives triumphantly at the end of her perilous voyage.

A man therefore who would observe but one portion, one point of the adventures of the ship, might only behold the period of danger, of struggles, and difficulties. The life of a man is not much, and a period of eight or ten centuries is not much also in the life of humanity, and especially in the infancy of humanity. We must contemplate the history of humanity from a higher and more distant point of view. Then we lose sight of the details ; the power of our understanding becomes clearer ; all evil is effaced, it disappears, and good only is blended with humanity, never to be again severed from it ; all, then, is seen evidently to tend to the same end, moral good and universal civilisation. The generation who beheld the invasions of the barbarians had to suffer severely from them, but their excesses and the disorders of liberty produced a yearning for order and peace. On the other hand, the infamies of some of the Roman emperors weighed heavily on those who beheld them, but they engendered a horror for despotism and a longing for liberty ; thus, from those experiments, fatal, it is true, to some victims, constantly results a moral truth, stronger and more powerful.

The invasions, brutalising in appearance, became a source of fecundity. The mixture of the men of the South with those of the North produced energy among the former, and it polished the latter. To this fusion and variety, Europe is indebted for having escaped the heaviness and languor of Asia. During about ten centuries a general confusion and fermentation is all that can be observed by the superficial student and the inexperienced thinker ; but a deeper investiga-

tion shows that such a state was not without its character and utility in the decrees of Providence, for it produced a new civilisation, the richest, the most fertile, and exuberantly full of the all-animating, all-vivifying sap. Europe was threatened with the invasion of the most hideous corruption ;—and all was regenerated. Such results assuredly are enough. Why should we attach so much importance to the scrutinizing of the details when the whole is so admirable. The decrees of Providence regarding mankind require ages to be accomplished. We must therefore contemplate their course in the march of ages, not judge the Colossus from the rude forms it has gone through, or from any of its minor parts, which might appear monstrous. Finally, we must forget our mean, insignificant individual, in order to gaze freely on the whole of humanity.

CHAPTER V.

Third Period of the History of Europe and Christian Civilisation.—The Middle Ages.—Character of that Period.—Fendalism.—The Fiefs and their Privileges.—State of the Church of Rome.—Her Corruption.—Hildebrand.—His Efforts.—Elected Pope in 1073.—His Reforms.—Struggle between Papacy and Henry IV. of Germany.—Subsequent Zeal of the Popes.—Alexander III.—Innocent III.—France.—Activity of the French Nation.—State of the North and South contrasted.—Successors of Hugh Capet.—Louis VI. (1108).—The Municipalities.—Their Revolutions.—Louis VII. (1137).—Philip Augustus (1180).—Greatness of his Reign.—The Albigensian War.—Louis VIII. (1223-1226).—Regency of Blanche of Castille.—Saint Louis (1231).—His Virtues and lofty Faculties.—Judiciary and Social Progress.—England.—Consequences of the Norman Conquest.—Successors of William the Conqueror.—William II. (1087).—Henry I. (1100).—Stephen (1135).—Henry II. (1154).—Richard Cœur de Lion (1189).—John (1199).—The Magna Charta (1215).—Henry III. (1216).—Commencement of the English Parliament.—Edward I. (1272).—Character of the English Constitution.—Importance of the Study of Laws.—Observation of Montesquieu on the English Constitution.

WE now commence the third period in the progress of Christian civilisation—a period chiefly filled by those ages of transition, called the *Middle Ages*, one of the most interesting epochs in history. New manners, new ideas, new institutions, have risen among men. The first fruits of Christianity are perceptible. Industry, sciences, languages, the arts, all assume an original form; although the traces of Roman civilisation and of Germanism are still conspicuous, nevertheless, characteristics totally novel reveal themselves to the student, who soon perceives the deep line of demarcation that separates the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries from those that preceded them.

The Middle Ages have been the object of abundant researches and historical labours in Europe; but they have seldom been investigated with an impartial judgment. That period has generally been either extolled with surpassing sympathy or deprecated beyond measure. For the antiquary who lives in perpetual rapture with Greek and Roman antiquities, the Middle Ages are only a period of barbarism and gross ignorance; while, in the eyes of the sceptical writers of the eighteenth century, they are exclusively a time of immorality, despotism and superstition. Subsequently, a reaction took place, and many professed an immeasurable admiration for that period; some have even extended their admiration so far as to propose it as a model for future ages, and have considered it a state of society to which we must ultimately return. It is needless to add that in this, as in most cases, truth is between the opposite extremes. Thus, men were certainly animated by a fervent faith during that epoch; no scepticism: a boundless devotion, undisturbed by material and political interests, animated alike all the united members of Christendom. But, on the other hand, the piety of those ages was outrageously superstitious; licentiousness and ferocity sullied their manners; gross as well as numerous abuses characterised the institutions which were scarcely formed and established; and there existed nothing like civil or political equality.

All the principal nations of Europe, as we have left them in our last chapter, did not advance with an equal step in the career of progress. They were, however, governed by the same general ideas, and by institutions bearing the same character. Religion was the principle and the end of all, whilst military functions were the form and means of action. The social movement was religious and military above all, as all questions of industry were of a very subordinate nature. The military organisation of that period is celebrated under the name of *Feudalism*.

The system of feudal government consisted in the largest portion of the landed property being divided into fiefs. All

the possessors of fiefs were bound to perform the military service, and formed a special class, the nobility, holding under their dependence the serfs who belonged and were bound to each fief. All the fiefs were hereditary. All the high military functions, those of duke, marquis, &c., had also become hereditary, and those who held them possessed on their estates, rights and privileges very nearly equal to those of a sovereign. Feudalism had its hierarchy. The first grade was composed of the simple possessors of fiefs; above them came, in various degrees, the higher nobles from whom they held their fiefs; these sometimes held their authority from a noble still richer and more powerful; and above all, stood the king, chief of the whole feudal nobility. The fief, although hereditary, required, for the full exercise of its privileges, the *investiture*, a ceremony, at once military and religious, which engaged the lord in regard to the vassal, and the vassal with regard to his lord; this ceremony seems a mixture of some Germanic custom with the old military oath of the Romans.

Every possessor of a fief was lord and master of the population of serfs on his estate; and the great feudal lords, with their regal authority, were as many little kings in the kingdom.* There was no unity excepting during war. Then the king convoked all his great vassals: these assembled also theirs, and thus downwards to the last degree of the military hierarchy; they all united and marched under the royal banner. The largest portion of the territory was, therefore, occupied by nobles with military functions, and their serfs. There only existed two authorities out of their pale. 1. The Church—proprietor also of large estates, several of which were obliged to military service; 2. The Cities—the inhabitants of which were held in great inferiority by the pride of the nobility; but which, during this period, arose from their abject nullity. The royal authority, therefore, was neither very powerful nor influential. The king was only the supreme chief of the feudal lords of the kingdom, and only possessed any real authority in his own dominion, in which

* See Appendix, No. IV. (a.)

no lord could place himself between his sovereignty and the simple possessors of fiefs: he could convoke assemblies, but they were very limited; and it was only towards the end of this period that the citizens of the cities were admitted to them, which connected them in States-General, and realized among Christian nations the great institution of an assembly of representatives. The royal authority dwelt chiefly in public opinion; and this was enough to enable royalty to overcome feudalism almost everywhere, and obtain a real authority.

The establishment of feudal government destroyed, in France, the municipal and political liberty of the Franks and Gauls, as well as the majesty and power of the Germanic and imperial royalty which Pepin and Charlemagne had revived over the ruins of the Roman world, after half a century of arduous labours and conquests. Despite the despotism of the feudal system, however, a last, pale gleam of liberty, although so often violated, could never be eradicated; namely, in the reciprocal rights of the lord and vassal, by which the latter could not be exposed to new charges and services, without having previously given his consent to it; thus, the vassals were only to obey the laws to which they had given their adhesion. This was, for a further period, however distant, the harbinger of the legitimate emancipation of a people who had preserved the sacred remembrance of their former independence.

On the other hand, feudalism became conducive to a greater centralisation and unity. The feudal lords waged war against each other; the small fiefs became gradually merged in the larger ones. Afterwards, the great feudal sovereignties alone preserved their regal privileges; and the decline of the feudal system gave greater ascendancy to royalty, whilst it favoured the progress of popular liberty, so long oppressed under the yoke of feudal despotism. "Feudality," says M. Guizot (*Civilisation of France*, Eleventh Lecture), "has been a first step out of barbarism—the passage from barbarism to civilisation: the most marked character of bar-

barism is the independence of the individual—the predominance of individualism; in this state every man acts as he pleases, at his own risk and peril. The ascendancy of the individual will and the struggle of individual forces, such is the great fact of barbarian society. This fact was limited and opposed by the establishment of the feudal system of government. The influence alone of territorial and hereditary property rendered the individual will more fixed and less ordered; barbarism ceased to be wandering; and was followed by a first step, a surpassing step towards civilisation nevertheless the individual independence still remained the predominating character of the new social state”

Feudalism, nevertheless, allowed a free scope to the despotism of kings and lords, and to the licentiousness of an omnipotent soldiery. In this disorderly and iniquitous state, the church was the only refuge, the only protector of the oppressed; and here commenced the political character and influence of the Roman church, so celebrated during this period for her audacity and vicissitudes. We must pause before it a while, previous to our continuing the outlines of the progress of the various Christian nations. The great principle assumed by the Papal authority, which soon became a moral basis in the public opinion, consisted in the proclamation, that there was on earth a power higher than that of kings and emperors, who, being all mere mortals also, owed obedience to the laws of Christian morality, and that any emperor, king, or prince, who ceased to obey the laws of God, had lost every right of exercising authority over men.

We have seen the Papal authority and independence firmly established by the supreme authority of Charlemagne. Subsequently, the Pontifical See remained long degraded. The Popes were mere temporal princes in the civil wars that consumed Italy; they participated in all the vilest political intrigues, and became the instruments of ambitious and unprincipled factions. When the crown of Lombardy and the imperial dignity were conferred on the kings of Germany,

the Popes sought, in them, a protector against the turbulent parties that were then dividing Italy ; but when those kings evinced a disposition to raise their own prerogatives above those of the church, and endeavoured to render the Papal influence a mere instrument to their imperial ambition, then the Popes opposed them with a violence and perseverance, enhanced undoubtedly by their conviction that their own cause was the cause of morality and justice ; but tinged also with a degree of ecclesiastical absolutism.

The middle of the eleventh century is, perhaps, the time of the greatest degradation of the church. Papacy was bowed down under the imperial supremacy ; the profligacy of the clergy was boundless ; and simony completed the reigning corruption. After the extinction of the house of the Othos, Henry the Third, king of Germany, ruled without control in Italy ; he had obtained his object, viz. to place Italy and Papacy under the absolute subjection of the kingdom of Germany ; the pontifical dignity became, in his hands, the instrument of his ambition. The canonical laws for the election of bishops were flagrantly violated. The kings and lords everywhere conferred the bishoprics and abbeys, and those appointments had become a dishonourable source of traffic. In Germany, especially, those abuses could not be surpassed. The clergy lived openly in the grossest licentiousness, and all ecclesiastical functions, instead of being a social and religious duty, had become a patrimony and an object of speculation.

Hildebrand, a priest, son of a Tuscan carpenter, had acquired a great influence at Rome during the pontificate of Leo IX. (1048.) Born with violent passions, he was painfully and deeply moved by the abject state of the church : he soon perceived the remedies that could be applied, and, gifted with a will of iron, he commenced his work of reformation with unbounded energy and skill. Leo IX. had placed in him an unlimited confidence, and, under this Pope and his four successors, Hildebrand never ceased to be the soul of the pontifical court. His object was to purify the sacerdotal body, to

deliver it from all temporal authority, and thus to create a uniform and general power, headed by the successor of St. Peter, and destined to the moral superintendence of the temporal authorities. This is the great political feature of the Middle Ages. Thus the unity of Europe was to be secured, and civilisation was to be protected from the rudeness of feudal manners. The first step was to establish the freedom of the Papal election, and, at the instigation of Hildebrand, Nicolas II. conferred, in 1059, on the cardinals alone the privilege of electing the Roman Pontiff, on the condition, however, that the election should be approved of by the clergy and the people, and also that certain privileges should be granted personally to the emperor. Soon after, both conditions were generally eluded.

At last, in 1073, Hildebrand himself ascended the pontifical throne, under the name of Gregory VII., and with him commenced a period of regeneration—a series of energetic reforms which no doubt command admiration. Eulogies on Hildebrand have been abundantly lavished by historians of the modern school—Dr. Arnold, M. Guizot, Dr. Voigt of Halle, and others—who cannot be accused of religious prejudices; and they have done so without any regard to the fatal ambition of Gregory, which has proved a precedent, imprudently followed by the Pontiffs. Gregory VII. became the founder of Papal pretensions and of spiritual despotism. Soon after his accession, he wrote a severe letter against simony, namely, the sale of ecclesiastical functions, with threatening warnings to Philip I. of France, and Henry IV. of Germany. In the following year, he convened a council at the Lateran, and proposed a law, not merely forbidding the marriage of priests, but commanding every priest to put away his wife. The clergy resisted with clamorous complaints and bitter reproaches; expostulations and murmurs assailed Hildebrand, who stood unmoveable and victorious. Not only were ecclesiastical functions publicly sold, but they were considered as fiefs, and the feudal lord invested the new possessor as he would have proceeded with any landed estate. This was a real

humiliation for the church, since sacerdotal functions were thus conferred and consecrated by temporal authority. Gregory VII. undertook to break the chains that held the church. In 1075, appeared his solemn forbidding any ecclesiastical *investiture* on the part of laymen, and threatening any layman, whether king or emperor, with excommunication, if they infringed his orders and conferred any ecclesiastical dignities. Here a long struggle commenced. Gregory met with opposition. Henry IV. took under his protection the bishops who resisted his decree. The Roman Pontiff summoned the emperor to his tribunal. The emperor assembled all his prelates, and had the deposition of Gregory pronounced. The latter replied with the thunder of excommunication. Hostilities commenced, and then came the war of the *Investiture*, which terminated by the Concordate of Worms, concluded in 1122 between Henry V. and Pope Calixtus II. The emperor renounced the right of investiture, and left to the church an unlimited liberty in the elections and ordinations. The Pope, on the other hand, granted to the emperor the right of being present at the elections, of intervention in case of dissensions, and of sanctioning the Pontiff at his election, in the investiture of the feudal states. Thus the dignity of the church was saved, and her influence continued in the political affairs of Europe as possessor of fiefs and benefices.

Gregory VII., by the very fact of his energetic struggle, had aggrandised the prestige of Papal authority. Excommunication was a formidable weapon suspended over the royal heads, and the popular voice was unanimously obedient to it. Gregory, moreover, had met with a powerful support in the Countess Mathilda, of Tuscany; the Normans of Sicily, following the Carolingian policy, were his faithful friends, and France had never ceased to protect the court of Rome. Afterwards, the Popes evinced their zeal for the benefit of Christian societies; they encouraged the Crusades, checked the immoralities of the kings and of the great, and protected the humble, proclaiming the morality of Christ, which is the same for all—rich and poor, high and low. Subsequently,

the church was divided by a fatal schism, and when unity was restored in the church, and Pope Innocent II. remained sole Pontiff (1130), new factions broke out in Rome, which disturbed the government of his successors. Then another struggle with Germany ensued, but of a different character from the preceding one. Frederick I., Barbarossa, of the house of Hohenstauffen, ascended the throne of Germany (1152), and a memorable war between Germany and Italy signalised his reign.

The Hohenstauffens claimed their rights over Italy as a special privilege of the imperial dignity since Charlemagne, and revived by Otho. Frederick considered Italy as a conquered country, the privileges of the municipalities of Lombardy as usurpations, and the prerogatives of the Pope as subordinate to those of the empire. The Pontiffs could not admit such gigantic pretensions, especially when the Hohenstauffens had, by a marriage, added the kingdom of Sicily to their empire, and they became the firm defenders of the liberties of Italy. The war between Frederick I. and the Pontiff commenced in 1154. Despite the Germanic resources, and the perseverance and genius of the first Hohenstauffen, Alexander III. and the free cities of Lombardy curbed the imperial pride. Papacy acquired new lustre and ascendancy; but Papal authority reached the zenith of grandeur and of boundless despotism under Innocent III. (1198.) Innocent III., scarcely thirty-seven years old when he became Pontiff, beheld all his undertakings crowned with success. With a great reputation for holiness, skill, and learning, he commenced his reign by seizing successively all the territories which had been taken from the Popes by the emperors. He intervened in a civil war in Germany, not only as mediator, but as a superior power;—he afterwards excommunicated the emperor, who lost his crown;—he forced Philip-Augustus, king of France, to take his queen, whom he had repudiated;—King John of England humbled himself before him;—he obliged Alphonso IX., king of Castille, to be separated from his wife Berengera, who was also his grand-daughter;—he received the sub-

mission of the kings of Arragon and of Portugal ;—he preached the atrocious crusade against the Albigenses ;—and, finally, terminated his life in 1216, after having been the arbiter of Europe, and truly the king of kings. After Innocent III., his successors continued his hostilities against the Hohenstauffens, who were the mortal foes of Papacy, until the final destruction of that family, so fertile in heroes.

The pontifical control, after manifesting itself again for a time in the Germanic elections, nevertheless began from this time to decline, and, as it will be seen, it afterwards vanished. We have only named here the general features of the Papal domination ; we shall find them more clearly defined in the subsequent events which we have to relate. Our intention has been to place in the foreground of this third period its two prominent features—feudalism and the pontifical authority, with their rival influences, their varied character, beneficial results, and despotic tendencies.

France remained one of the great agencies of Christian civilisation, whilst she was working towards her formation and her internal constitution. France only commenced at the end of the fifteenth century to exercise an influence, and to act as a national body—as a unity. But, whatever her deeds and influence became then, as a whole, her activity and influence are manifest during this period of the Middle Ages, by the individual efforts that were made in the nation. Thus French knighthood is to be seen ever onwards in every great martial enterprise. The crusades were chiefly a French impetus. Sicily was snatched from the Saracens by French knights. French chivalry opposed the Moors in Spain, founded the kingdom of Portugal, and fixed during fifty-seven years the French standard and the ascendancy of the West at Constantinople (1204-1261) ;—in short, France was considered both as the vanguard and the pillar of the Roman church. In the meantime, the civilising labours of peace were also distinguished. The fusion of the races of France, in a national unity, was accomplished sooner than in any other land. Whatever reforms the church endeavoured to intro-

duce—such as the truce of God, the abolition of judicial duel—they were at once accepted, defended, propagated, by France. She assumed the initiative in the enfranchisement of the communities and of the serfs ; she produced some of the purest germs of modern literature. During this period, the university of Paris became one of the great luminaries of Europe, and French activity was visible everywhere ; whilst the French language, so facile, clear, flowing—true expression of the French genius—was assuming her final form and character.

When Hugh Capet, duke of France, received the royal dignity, he became the first lord of France, but his authority did not extend beyond his own dominions, where, moreover, it was controlled by feudal rights. France was then limited to the territories between the rivers Rhone, Soâne, and Meuse. Lorraine acknowledged the imperial sovereignty ; the lands at the east of the Vosges were still forming a part of the kingdom of Burgundy ; they were soon merged in the Germanic vassalage, and Lyons long remained a Germanic imperial city ; but this separation was especially feudal ; many of those countries remained morally linked to France. Feudalism had a French origin ; and at the time of the first Capetian, France comprised then more than 70,000 small fiefs, and above them about eighty principalities, independent of each other ; but there were eight great feudatory lords, among whom was the king, whose supremacy was acknowledged by all the others ; this supremacy, it is true, was often purely nominal.

The south of France differed deeply from the north. The southern provinces had not taken so great a part in the facts accomplished by the Merovingian and Carolingian dynasties ; they had preserved an abundant share of Roman spirit. Their language, laws and customs had not undergone the same transformation ; there the Roman law still existed ; feudalism was never absolutely installed, and the south always possessed a large proportion of alodial lands. The southern lords also, at so great a distance from the royal authority, soon rendered their allegiance very slight ; they encouraged the spirit of

scepticism, of federalism, and laxity of manners in the populace, and could therefore rely on their sympathy and support; they considered themselves as forming a different race and country, and called their countrymen of the north *the French*.

With Hugh Capet commenced a new order of succession to the throne. The kingdom ceased to be divided among the royal sons, and the principle of primogeniture for the inheritance of the crown was gradually established. Until Philip-Augustus, however, the kings associated their eldest son to the crown, or obtained before their death the approbation of the great feudatory lords for the succession. The reigns of Hugh Capet, and of his successors, Robert the Pious, Henry I., and Philip I., fill the latter part of the tenth and the whole of the eleventh century, without any mighty or very important event to signalise the activity and movement of the new monarchy. Under Robert, Burgundy was annexed to the crown, to be detached again from it under the reign of his successor, Henry I., in favour of his brother Robert, head of the first house of Burgundy. Under this same Henry, the Hautevilles and other Norman knights crossed the Alps, arrived in Italy as adventurers, and there became the founders of a new kingdom. Under Philip I., two great events took place, in which French royalty had no participation whatever, viz., the conquest of England and the first crusade. With Louis VI., the Fat (1108), son of Philip, the new dynasty entered a career of activity that produced some of the most prominent features in the progress of France.

Louis VI., sensible of the ancient rights of royalty, undertook to deliver the crown from the proud audacity of independent and ambitious vassals;—he undertook to protect the people—to defend the church; in short, to act not only as a military chief, but as an administrator, whose duty it is to secure the well-being of all. He was the first of the French kings who established the principle of authority in the crown to issue acts of general legislation, by which the feudal system was ruined. There was no precedent, no law established, to

justify the assumption of such a privilege ; it was, therefore, a usurpation, but warmly approved and supported by the church and the people. Royalty thus became the protector of the weak, created among the masses a great respect for the reigning race, and tended to the material unity of the nation. Louis VI. displayed a surpassing activity, but all his wars were confined to a narrow circle, and had no important results. For the first time, however, since Charlemagne, France exhibited all her power to Europe. The Germanic emperor, Henry V., announced his intention of invading France, in order to succour the duke of Normandy. The king advanced to meet him with an army so imposing and formidable, that the emperor, on beholding it, withdrew. But this army was not merely composed of feudal lords ; a large portion of it consisted in the militia of the municipalities. Already, an important revolution had taken place ;—the municipalities (or communities) had obtained their enfranchisement—another fatal blow struck on feudalism.

Most of the ancient Roman cities had preserved their liberties, especially in the south. After the arrival of the Franks, other cities formed themselves, and they also gradually assumed the privileges of appointing their own magistrates, of attending to their own internal affairs, and to the police of the city. In the north, the magistrates were generally called *échevins* (*scabini*), or mayors (*majores*) ; in the south, *consuls*. Many of the new cities had obtained their municipal prerogatives during the dissensions that preceded the accession of the Capetian dynasty. Those cities where the feudal lord or bishop had taken possession of the government by force were not so favoured ; the condition of their inhabitants did not differ much from that of the serfs. The system of feudal government, with its heartless insolence, was gradually threatening the independence of every city. All the men with sword and shield looked down with scorn on the inhabitants of a city devoted to industry and commerce. The revolutions of the communities brought a remedy to those evils ; their result was to guarantee the municipal liberties of every city, to assign to

each a share in the political affairs, a co-operation in the military service, and to render their inhabitants free citizens.

There existed a general similarity in these local revolutions. The citizens usually assembled in the market-place, and took the oath of mutual assistance; they afterwards formed their militia and appointed their magistrates. When the lord or bishop resisted, they had recourse to arms. The dramatic episodes of the revolutions of Laon and Amiens are a proof of the energetic efforts frequently displayed by the citizens. Many of those revolutions, however, were pacific. The citizens applied to the supreme authority, whether feudal or royal, in order to obtain the grant of a charter, namely, a written constitution, as a guarantee. Often this charter was granted in exchange for a large sum of money raised among the citizens. This progress in the cities commenced at the end of the tenth century, and continued vigorously favoured by the kings of France; for, although the fact has been refuted, the municipalities must, when necessary, have become a strong bulwark against the pretensions of the great vassals. But it should not be supposed, however, that the cities, the charters of which are preserved, or of whom a record of their revolution is found in the chronicles of those ages, were those which alone had acquired and enjoyed their enfranchisement. Many others had at all times extensive municipal privileges, such as Paris, and the cities of Flanders especially, among whom Liege, Ghent and Bruges became so powerful, that their militia of citizens could set at defiance lords and kings. The organisation of these militias was one of the most important privileges of the municipalities; parallel with it existed the organisation of their various trades, namely, the German system of voluntary societies, or guilds, spreading to the whole community, with their laws and hierarchy. Thus the inhabitants of a city were divided into a military-defending and a working body. Through the militia, the cities formed a part of the feudatory armies, served the nation, and commanded the respect of an arrogant chivalry. Their citizens often raised themselves by their industry and valour to an equality

with the nobility ; thus the distinction of classes was tending to decline.

The son of Louis the Fat, Louis VII., the Young (1137), left the administration in the hands of Suger, who had been his tutor and the confidential friend of his father. The government, therefore, was continued in the same spirit. The first events of this reign were, a dissension with the Pope Innocent II., and the participation of the king in the second crusade. Soon after, a long war broke out with England. Henry Plantagenet, the British king, was possessed of Anjou, Maine, and Touraine, his patrimonial estates—of Normandy, brought by his mother—and of Gascony and Aquitaine, through his wife Eleanor, who had been repudiated by her first husband, the king of France. Louis endeavoured to seize upon Aquitaine by force of arms, but the vassal was more powerful than his lord. The war was protracted without any material result. It was a feudal struggle, and not a war between nations. The Plantagenets considered themselves as French barons, before all : England was, in their eyes, but a conquered country.

After Louis VII. (1180), Philip-Augustus shed a new lustre on the French monarchy. He blended a superior capacity and great energy, with a somewhat unscrupulous craftiness. Continuing the war with Henry, he profited by the divisions between the old English king and his sons, to lay his grasp upon Berry. He had already taken Amiens, the Valois, and the Vermandois, from the count of Flanders, when the news arrived of Jerusalem having fallen into the hands of the infidels, and Philip-Augustus undertook the third crusade with Richard Cœur de Lion. On their return to Europe, a war broke out again between them, and the king of France obtained the allegiance of Auvergne, which had belonged to Guyenne. On the death of the lion-hearted king, Philip-Augustus declared himself the protector of young Arthur ; a war ensued, again without any decisive result. But when Poitou, Anjou, Touraine and Normandy revolted against King John—who, when cited before the tribunal of the king of France, to be judged by his peers, refused to appear—and

when young Arthur had been assassinated—then the public opinion favoured powerfully the arms of Philip. His chivalry took possession of all those provinces, and a treaty was afterwards drawn, by which Normandy, Maine, Touraine, Anjou and part of Poitou were annexed to France.

Philip, being subsequently invited by the Pope to conquer England, had made his preparations, when King John effected his reconciliation with Innocent III. The expedition was forbidden; but, his forces being collected, he turned to chastise the count of Flanders, who had been the ally of John, and who was protected by King Otho IV. and the Germanic armies. John, on the other hand, attacked Anjou, and was joined by most of the great feudatory lords of France. A formidable league was threatening Philip-Augustus, but the church and the people were devoted to the king of France. The league was crushed at the great battle of Bouvines—a victory that shed an additional splendour on the French monarchy. Philip-Augustus, it is seen, considerably enlarged his kingdom. He was a brave and skilful administrator; he particularly favoured the municipalities, to whose militia he was partly indebted for the victory of Bouvines. He embellished Paris and added to the privileges of the university. The public voice proclaimed him the prince who had done the most for the prosperity of all, and public gratitude annexed the lofty epithet of *Augustus* to his name.

Two memorable events in which the crown had but a very slight participation took place during the reign of Philip-Augustus. Firstly, the establishment of a French empire at Constantinople, which fact belongs to the history of the crusades; and, secondly, the implacable war or crusade against the Albigenses, the result of which was, the final annexation of the South to the North, a great step towards the unity of the kingdom assuredly; but this was a religious war on the surface merely, and in the eyes of the fanatics, while it was the antagonism of two races and of the two eternal principles engaged in a mortal combat—feudalism and despotism, with the federalism and liberalism of the South.

The cities of the South, and among them *Albi*, had partially revived the old heresy of the Manichæans, with all its follies ; its latitude was favourable to the southern passions ; all the grades of society in Languedoc and Provence were hostile to the despotic restrictions of the church ; the powerful influence and eloquence of St. Bernard, the efforts of the missionaries sent from Rome, both had failed in their endeavours to restore those populations to the unity of the church. Then, Pope Innocent III. launched an excommunication ; it remained powerless, and it was soon followed by the preaching of a crusade against the infidels of the South. The struggle commenced ; a struggle fearfully bloody, sullied by an incredible refinement of ferocity and by dishonourable proceedings on the part of the agents of the vicar of Christ. On one side—all the chivalry of the North, commanded by Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester ; on the other—all the last representatives of the federalism of the South : Raymond, count of Toulouse ; the king of Arragon ; the invincible count of Foix ; the heroic young viscount of Beziers. After committing ravages that might almost have caused Attila and his Huns to shudder, Montfort defeated the federal army of the Albigenes at Muret (1213).* He received afterwards from the Pope the sovereignty of the largest portion of the great feudatory territories of the South ; but at last, his inexorable and barbarous government changed the resignation of the conquered into the madness of despair. Toulouse made one last powerful effort, and drove away the French. Montfort returned with fury to retake the city, but met with an obscure death under its walls (1218) ; young Raymond was at the head of his countrymen. The Pope continued his persecutions : he established the memorable Inquisition, which was afterwards perfected by his successors ; and the Christian rack gave its succour in the extirpation of heresy.

Philip-Augustus had always resisted the exhortations of the Pope, and refused to take a direct part in the crusade against the Albigenes ; but his son and successor, Louis VIII.,

* See Appendix, No. IV. (b.)

during his short reign (1223-1226) had the weakness to abandon the war against the English and the conquest of Guyenne, in order to march against the Albigenses at the head of an army of nearly 200,000 men. He reached Avignon, whose resistance he could not punish; his army was decimated by fever and famine; several of the cities of Languedoc opened their gates to the king, but he was obliged to abandon the hope of even approaching Toulouse. Another contagion was spreading destruction in the French ranks; and he withdrew, carrying along with him the fatal germ. He died in Auvergne, leaving a son, a minor, the immortal St. Louis, and the regency in the hands of his queen, Blanche of Castille.

The regent continued the war with the South, and it was terminated through the mediation of the count of Champagne. The count of Toulouse (Raymond VII.), in order to restore peace to his unfortunate subjects, and finding that a further resistance only prepared their ruin, resigned himself to an ignominious treaty. He abandoned Avignon to the Holy See, seven of his largest fiefs to the king; he ordered the destruction of the mighty walls of his capital, received a French garrison, and ensured his succession to Joanna, his daughter, who was betrothed to young Alfonso of Poitiers, brother of Louis IX. The broken-hearted prince, along with all that remained of the heroes of the South, served afterwards in the armies of St. Louis, and they vanished in a complete obscurity. Northern France triumphed over Southern France; the language *d'oïl*—language of the *Trouvères*—obtained the pre-eminence over the language *d'oc*, so much more graceful and rich; the latter became reduced to the state of a vulgar patois. The wars of the Albigenses and the Inquisition had shattered the lyre of the *Troubadours*.*

The regency of Blanche of Castille was contrary to the custom of the state; and a formidable league of French princes and barons was formed against her; but Blanche, by her skill and energy, and with the assistance of Thibault, count

* See Appendix, No. IV. (c.)

of Champagne, her poetical and devoted suitor, baffled their hostile projects. Thibault was assailed by the league on account of his defection; but was defended and protected by St. Louis, who attained his majority in 1231.

St. Louis (IX.) is one of the noblest figures in history. His justice, valour, piety, goodness, and genius for administration, left indelible traces in the French monarchy. His virtues shed a Christian splendour on royalty. His intellect and integrity rendered him the arbiter between nations. His fame is almost unparalleled, owing to an astounding combination of the loftiest faculties displayed at such a period. He united the special virtues of a king and of a hero—of a diplomatist, a churchman and a legislator; he managed to conciliate all. He was the champion of the church, and yet undermined her power. He was the respecter of all feudal rights and obligations; nevertheless, he destroyed the life of feudalism. He was actuated by the most rigid—the most austere piety, yet did not scruple to order a culprit to be hung, on the Sunday, in front of the church, immediately after divine service. St. Louis is the purest expression, the fairest realisation, of eclecticism, to be met with in history.

The life of Louis IX., like that of his predecessors, was one of incessant activity. He crushed, at the battle of Taillebourg and Saintes, a rebellion of the great vassals of the South. Soon after the house of France acquired Provence by the marriage of his brother, Charles d'Anjou, with Beatrice, the heiress of that county; but, on the other hand, he considerably enfeebled the kingdom by restoring to England—either from political reasons, or owing to an excessive feeling of justice and integrity—the Limousin and Perigord, that had been conquered. Louis, however, wasted his greatest energy and resources in two crusades, both fatal in their results and hollow in their object. We will allude to them on another occasion. But the prominent fact of the reign of Louis IX. is, the progress in the judiciary and administrative departments.

New institutions had been engendered by feudalism, and

they entered deeply into the spirit of the constitution. Such were, for instance, the Court of Peers, and the *Plaidis*, or general parliaments. The Court of Peers was the highest tribunal in the kingdom ; it was the assembly of the great feudatories, who owed allegiance to the king only. It not unfrequently had to pronounce upon political questions ; Philip-Augustus reduced it to twelve members, six laymen and the rest from the church. The Carolingian custom of a general parliament or annual assembly round the king, of all the feudal lords of France, and ecclesiastical dignitaries, had been preserved ; the *Bourgeoisie* (called Burgages) were soon to join them, and obtained a voice in the affairs of the kingdom. The Burgages must be distinguished from the communities ; they were villages around the castles enjoying privileges but no municipal independence. The crown having acquired many of the great fiefs—this, together with the enfranchisement of the cities, had weakened feudalism to a considerable degree. Under Louis IX. a more decisive progress took place : private wars and judicial combat were abolished. The *establishments of St. Louis* were the first trial toward a uniform legislation for the whole nation. They are one of the most valuable and ancient monuments of civil law ; the obligation imposed upon all the mayors of cities, to come yearly and have their accounts examined in Paris, prepared the admission of the communities in the general parliaments ; the institution over all the royal estates, of magistrates or royal judges, besides the feudal judges, invested the crown with the administration of justice ; limits were assigned to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and the convention (pragmatic sanction) regulated the temporal authority of the clergy, and established the reciprocal relations with the court of Rome. France, during this epoch, was advancing with a firm step in the way of all progress, holding, with justice, a conspicuous position in the advancement of Christian civilisation.

England, previous to the Norman Conquest, had grown completely estranged from the movement of Europe ; the laws, manners, and society, on the whole, had not followed the

progress of the nations of central Europe. The expedition of William the Conqueror was in truth a real crusade. It received the consecration of the Pope, and knights from all parts of Europe came under his standard ; the conquest brought a total modification to the social state of England ; feudalism was introduced—the lands distributed among the conquerors—the Saxon bishops expelled everywhere, to make room for the Normans—and the Norman French installed. In short, England became an appendix of France, and her princes preferred their title of French dukes to any other.

Feudalism, however, assumed in England a form different from that of other countries : as it was introduced by William, he introduced along with it ameliorations of great utility to royalty ; thus, he divided the whole kingdom into baronies, and bestowed them, under the tenure of military service, on his Norman followers. Not so exclusively, however, as generally supposed hitherto. Thus the feudatories in England were closely allied to the crown. Preparatory to the introduction of the feudal tenures a general survey of all the lands in the kingdom was planned and accomplished, with an enumeration of all the inhabitants. It is the celebrated and valuable record, called *Doomsday Book*, finished in 1086, and of which Sir Henry Ellis has given, in our time, an admirable and complete analysis. But this organisation soon underwent many modifications ; many of the baronies rose above the others, and became a body of high barons ; the baronies of an inferior importance moreover divided among themselves, and subdivided again—and the result of those fractions led to the existence of an inferior but independent chivalry. Thus, the internal history of England offers a character very different from that of France. The English king had not only to wage war against his great feudal lords, and annex their estates to the royal territories, but was obliged to prepare for a general struggle with the whole nobility, which formed a strong aristocratic body, in order to defend the central authority of the crown.

William the Conqueror baffled a conspiracy of his barons and several revolts of the Anglo-Saxons ; he waged successful

wars in Scotland and Wales, and left the crown to his worthless son, William II., Rufus. William II. had the good fortune to defeat a conspiracy of his barons, and he incurred also the contempt and hatred of the clergy. After thirteen years of a dull reign of despotism, he was killed, when hunting (1100). His elder brother Robert being absent on a crusade, he was succeeded by his younger brother Henry. Henry I. secured for himself the support of the barons and the church, by giving them a guarantee of their privileges, the first charter, and then invaded his brother's dominions of Normandy, in spite of the opposition of France. His daughter Matilda married Geoffrey Plantagenet of Anjou, destined to be his successor; but when Henry died in 1135, after a reign of thirty-five years, his nephew Stephen seized the vacant throne. The dukes of Anjou reclaimed the crown; a war of eighteen years ensued, finally terminated by a treaty which secured the succession of Stephen to Henry, son of Matilda, who became king in 1154.

The reign of Henry II. began with every promise of prosperity and happiness. Besides England and Normandy, he reigned over Maine and Anjou, his patrimonial dominions; over Poitou, Guyenne, and Aquitaine, dowry of his queen Eleanor. Nevertheless, he was defeated in all his projects, unfortunate in his wars with France, broken-hearted by the hostilities of his sons. His only successful enterprise was in Ireland; the English authority in that island was for a long time purely nominal, and it was not considered as fully subdued till the reigns of Elizabeth and James I.

One of the most curious episodes of the reign of Henry II. is the well-known history of Thomas à Becket. The king, by the constitutions of the parliament at Clarendon, endeavoured to deprive the clergy of some of its most important prerogatives, and expected to find a docile instrument in Thomas à Becket, whom he had raised from obscurity to the office of Chancellor of England, and afterwards to the See of Canterbury. But à Becket, who at first had signed the articles of Clarendon, resolved to defend the rights of religion and spi-

ritualism against the encroachment of royal despotism ; he retracted, and submitted to the most severe penance for having yielded to criminal persuasions. A' Becket may be considered as the representative of the oppressed Anglo-Saxons, and the king as the expression of regal and Norman despotism. The Pope annulled the decrees of Clarendon : à Becket, deprived of all his dignities and estates, fled to France. Afterwards, both parties finding it their interest to come to a good understanding, a reconciliation took place. But the archbishop, soon after his return, excommunicated all those who were adhering to the articles of Clarendon. The wrath of the king exploded ; it was a signal for his courtiers to commit a cowardly murder ; à Becket was assassinated at the foot of the altar by four knights. The just indignation and threats of the people alarmed Henry. He yielded to popular opinion, affected deep regret, submitted to an humble penitence, and received the fruit of so complete an hypocrisy by obtaining the absolution of the Pope ; the articles of Clarendon, however, were abandoned ; and the law of investiture became very similar to that of the Concordate of Worms.

When Henry II. expired, worn out by sorrow and debauchery, out of four sons he had only two left. Richard, celebrated by his ferocious prowess, but perfectly null as a king, succeeded him (1189). He joined Philip-Augustus in a crusade, where he displayed incredible valour. On his return from the Holy Land, as he was travelling in disguise through Germany, he was taken prisoner by the duke of Austria, whom he had insulted, and at length ransomed by his subjects. Richard met afterwards with an obscure death while storming the castle of one of his vassals in the Limousin, and was succeeded by John (Lackland), in 1199.

Few reigns are more deplorable than that of John. The assassination of his nephew Arthur, and his tyranny, rendered him odious to his subjects. He was stripped by Philip of his continental dominions, and made the Pope his enemy by an avaricious attack on the treasures of the church ; he was excommunicated and deposed, when a submission on his knees

to the Papal legate saved him ; this humiliation, and the loss of the battle of Bouvines, put no bounds to the contempt and hatred of his people. The barons of the kingdom assembled, and resolutely demanded from the king a ratification of the charter of privileges granted by Henry I. In spite of the representations of the Pope, the confederate barons insisted on their demand, and the sword became their last resource. At length John was compelled to yield, and signed, at Runnymede (19th June 1215), the articles of the *Magna Charta*, the foundation and bulwark of English liberty.

John granted at the same time the *Charta de Foresta*, which abolished the royal privilege of killing game over all the kingdom, and restored to the lawful proprietors their woods and forests ;* but, determined to disregard these concessions, he endeavoured with a foreign force to reduce the barons into submission. The latter, however, applied for aid to France, and Philip sent his son Louis to England with an army ; the people of England, in hatred of their sovereign, swore allegiance to this foreigner ; but John dying at Newark, 1216, an instant change ensued. His son, Henry III., a boy nine years old, was crowned at Bristol, and his uncle, the earl of Pembroke, appointed protector of the realm ; the barons returned to their allegiance, and the French, after an ineffectual struggle, evacuated the kingdom.

Henry III. (1216), had no more capacity than his father ; the barons revolted again several times, and the king was always obliged to yield ; his wars with France were unfortunate ; his exactions a cause of general discontent. At last Simon de Montfort, son of the chief of the crusade against the Albigenses, and brother-in-law of Henry III., placed himself at the head of the opposition. At first, the king allowed the Parliament of 1258 to appoint a committee of twenty-four members, bishops and barons, charged with the state reforms. But these reformers took advantage of their authority ; and, after many abuses and deceptions, the royal party recovered its absolute ascendancy ; it was not, however,

* See Appendix, No. IV. (d.)

to be of long duration. The barons sprang to arms again, and their victory of Lewes placed the government in their hands. Then Leicester governed the kingdom, and his short reign is a memorable epoch in the constitutional history of England; for he called a Parliament, summoning two knights from each of the counties, and deputies from the principal boroughs,—the first regular plan of the English House of Commons. This assembly exercising its just rights, and asserting the re-establishment of the ancient government of the kingdom, Leicester judged it prudent to release Prince Edward from the confinement in which he was kept, with his father, since the battle of Lewes. Edward was no sooner at liberty than he took the field, and Leicester was defeated and slain in the battle of Evesham (1265). The prince, after having established domestic tranquillity, embarked in the last crusade, with Louis IX., and was on his return to England when he received intelligence of his accession to the crown, by the death of his father, 1272.

We have seen the first elements of the English constitution, which, owing to the special character of the establishment of the Normans, differed from those of other countries. We have stated that, in England, the crown had no war to wage against the great feudatory lords of the realm. The right of administering justice, and of general administration, was, at all times, acknowledged as a royal prerogative. The king, like all feudal princes, assembled periodically a court of his immediate lords, the feudal tribunal of his own possessions, and called also the more universal assembly of the clergy and barons of the kingdom, which took the name of Parliament. All the great barons and knights of the crown were present at it, as well as the bishops and principal abbots. The financial affairs obliged its being frequently assembled, and the Parliament had a participation in every affair of the state.

The mass of the free nation consisted in the clergy, the great barons, the inferior chivalry, and the cities. The *Magna*

Charter was a guarantee of the privileges of those classes; the people were not mentioned in it—they were serfs. This great charter, besides establishing feudal provisions of great importance at that time, protected the subject against numerous oppressions. With respect to private rights, it established the testamentary power of the subject. In matters of public police and national concern, it enjoined a uniformity of weights and measures, and gave various encouragements to commerce. With regard to the administration of justice, it prohibited all denials or delays of it—fixed the Court of Common Pleas at Westminster; and, to facilitate still more its administration, it directed assizes to be taken in the proper counties, and the establishment of annual circuits; it fettered the authority of the king's inferior ministers, and regulated the time and place of holding the inferior tribunals of justice, the County Court, Sheriff's Tourn, and Court-Leet. It confirmed and established the liberties of the city of London, and other cities, boroughs, towns, and ports of the kingdom. And, lastly, and above all, it protected every individual of the nation in the free enjoyment of his life, his liberty, and his property, unless declared to be forfeited by the judgment of his peers, or the law of the land. Such were the immortal privileges secured by the Great Charter; and its first great progress, as we have stated, was when, through Leicester, knights, citizens, and burgesses, were summoned to Parliament. The other great period in the legal history of England commences with the reign of Edward the First, to which we will return on another occasion.

We bring this Chapter to a close, having passed rapidly, as it is our object, over several of the most prominent features of the history of Europe—feudalism, and the zenith of pontifical authority, with the commencements of the modern laws and institutions of France and England. However cursory the glance we have cast on those subjects, we trust we have done enough to point out their vital importance in the history of the Christian nations, and to induce students to turn to those works in which they are developed with abundance

and skill. Upon Englishmen, more especially, devolves the duty of a wholesome knowledge of the laws and constitution of their country. Without it, let no one have the pretension of calling himself enlightened and educated. What ! Shall a subject of England, which is looked up to with veneration by Europe as the first land where, since the days of barbarism and feudalism, the sparks of the liberty of the world have been preserved, remain ignorant of the mechanism and progress of the British constitution ? Again, it must be finally understood that the history of one's own country is not merely a list of kings and battles ; but that its more valuable part consists in the progress of liberty—in the origin and growth of the most valued institutions. It has often been said that the people of England live under one of the most artificial and complicated constitutions ever possessed by a country : if so, it is the very reason for every Englishman to devote a fair portion of his studies to the constitution of his own country. He would afterwards find himself in possession of an admirable key for the study of general history, and would feel and understand the observation of Montesquieu, that “ the English is the only nation in the world, where political or civil liberty is the direct end of its constitution.”

CHAPTER VI.

Third Period continued.—Importance of Method in the Study of History.—Germany.—Character of her History.—Conrad of Franconia (911).—Henry I. (919).—Otho I. (936).—Greatness of his Reign.—Otho II. (973).—Otho III. (983).—Henry II. (1002).—Conrad II. (1024).—Henry III. (1039).—Henry IV. (1056).—State of Lombardy.—Its Municipal Organisation.—State of Southern Italy.—Conquests of the Normans.—Quarrel of Henry IV. with Gregory VII.—Wars in Germany.—Henry V. (1106).—Lothair II. (1125).—Conrad III., of Hohenstauffen (1137).—Origin of the Guelfs and Ghibellins.—Frederic I., Barbarossa (1152).—His Wars in Germany and Lombardy.—Henry VI. (1190).—Philip (1198).—Otho IV. (1208).—Frederic II. (1212).—His War with the Pope and the Guelfs.—His Death (1250).—Interregnum.—Constitutions of Italy and Germany.—The Crusades.—Object and Consequences of the Crusades.—Tendencies of the Church.—St. Bernard.—The Mendicant Orders.—Ecclesiastical Legislation.—Changes in Feudalism.—Chivalry.—Its Origin.—Commerce.—Architecture.—Its Splendour during the Middle Ages.—The Vernacular Literature of Italy, France, and Germany.—The Universities.—Scholasticism.—Abelard.—Attacks on the Church and Clergy.—Arnold of Brescia.—The Vaudois.—Study of the Roman Law.—Chronicles.—Science.—Roger Bacon.—Character of this Epoch.

It has been seen that our method for the study of history consists in acquiring a general, wholesome knowledge of the characteristics of every age, and of the progressive phases of civilisation. This method does not permit us to bring a careful and continued attention to the movements intervening between the prominent features of an age or of a society. The times between the great revolutions, and influenced by them, as well as the biographical and material history, can afterwards become the object of special studies and private

reading. But we do not fear to repeat, that if the general progressive features of civilisation, as well as its gradual periods, are not well understood, all historical reading leaves the mind in a state of confusion. The absence of method leaves a perpetual veil over all; the whole tale of the world's doings remains a puzzle and a mystery.

The object of this chapter is most extensive. We intend to draw the characteristics of Germany and Italy as far as the epoch to which we have brought France and England; and also those of the crusades, the fine arts, the sciences, industry and literature.

In *Germany*, the forms of barbarism and the hostilities of race subsisted longer than in any other part of Christian Europe. The Carolingian administration admitted but slowly anything in the shape of reform or modifications. Feudalism was introduced later than in France and Italy. But Germany roused somewhat suddenly, and assumed a great social function, viz., the extermination and expulsion of all the barbarian tribes attacking the northern and eastern frontiers, and threatening Europe. The accomplishment of this great work was the foundation of Germanic greatness, which permitted the sovereigns to aspire to the imperial crown. Afterwards, the ambition of princes, the struggles with Papacy and Italy, ruined this transient grandeur of Germany. A fatal partition, absence of unity, and hostilities, ensued, and became the inevitable causes of great misfortunes and of a general decline. The Germanic crown was elective, and the kingdom divided in five great duchies, Franconia, Saxony, Bavaria, Suabia, and, for a time, Thuringia, which soon ceased to be a special duchy, whilst Lorraine passed under the Germanic domination, and formed the two duchies of Higher and Lower Lorraine. The Slavonian tribes inhabiting the land between the north of the Adriatic and the Elb, became successively converted to Christianity and annexed to Germany. Thus were formed, in the eleventh century, the duchies of Austria and Carinthia, and the duchy of Bohemia, whose princes soon made allegiance to Germany, and took their places among the electors of the

empire. The ducal dignity was conferred by popular election and royal appointment. The dukes filled all the high functions at the court of the sovereign; under them came the Margraves, who were military commanders, and the Counts (*Grafs*), each commanding a county (*gau*). None of these functions were hereditary.

We saw the election of Conrad, duke of Franconia, as king of Germany, in 911. The ambition and mutual divisions of the princes allowed of no peace. Conrad had the grief to find opponents in every direction. The Huns took advantage of the internal troubles of Germany, and committed fearful depredations. They pushed their frontier to the very confines of Bavaria. Conrad received a mortal wound in fighting these ferocious barbarians at the very time when his valour had triumphed over domestic rebellion. In his last moments he represented to his brother, and all those around him, that the most advantageous measure for the salvation of the Germanic body would be to recognise his former enemy, Henry, or, *Heinrich*, duke of Saxony, as his successor. Accordingly, the ensigns of royalty were taken to Henry I. (919), surnamed the *Fowler*, because, when he received the news of his elevation, he was occupied in the pursuit of birds. The personal qualities of the new emperor were of an elevated order; and his vast power—not as emperor, for little was attached to that dignity, but as duke of Saxony and Thuringia—enabled him to effect more good than any of his predecessors since Charlemagne. By his wise and vigorous measures he soon obtained the submission of the dukes of Suabia and Bavaria, and prevailed also on Lorraine to join the Germanic confederation; and, thus strengthened, he prepared to withstand the Hungarians, to whom his predecessors had been constrained to pay a tribute as the price of forbearance. He defeated them;—he attacked afterwards, and exterminated, the predatory bands whom Conrad had been unable to extirpate. He erected many fortresses for the defence of the empire, formed a permanent militia, to whom he granted extraordinary privileges, and placed them in the fortified towns which he raised. Henry

is the true founder of the Germanic burghs, of those places which, in after-ages, were not only destined to defend the country, but to serve as nurseries of freedom. He laid the foundation of municipal institutions, and closed, in 936, one of the most useful and splendid reigns recorded in history.

Henry had declared his son Otho his successor; but that recognition required to be confirmed by the proper diet of election. The German dukes assembled at Aix-la-Chapelle, and placed Otho I. on the throne of Charlemagne. His reign was also magnificently eventful. During the greater part of it he was occupied in quelling the turbulence of his great feudatories—a fate inseparable from the dignity. He triumphed over all the rebels; he compelled the duke Bohemia to submit and to restore Christianity, which he had abolished; he defeated with great slaughter the Slavonians of the regions bordering on the Oder, and founded two bishoprics—Havelburg and Brandenburg—which might furnish missionaries for their conversion; he obtained a no less signal success over the Danes, to hasten whose conversion he also founded bishoprics in Schleswig and Holstein. But his most splendid exploits were with the Huns, over whom he obtained, in 955, at Lech, near Augsburg, one of the greatest victories known in history. It enabled him to extend and consolidate the Margrave of Austria. Yet, the pre-eminent fact in Otho's reign was his obtaining the imperial crown. We saw at the close of the preceding period the unfortunate state of Italy; Otho took advantage of the troubles which agitated it, to reduce it to his sway; and he procured the imperial crown from John XII. He indeed ruled at Rome as he pleased. The kings of Germany claimed the empire as their right; and, afterwards, Otho, in appointing Leo VIII. as Pope, assumed a prerogative that had belonged to the last Roman emperors and to the Carolingians—that of rendering the imperial sanction necessary to the Papal election—a pretension that became the source of sanguinary contentions.

Posterity has styled Otho I., *the Great*, owing more to his success in battle, and the accidental splendour of his reign,

than to his real wisdom and patriotism. He had procured the coronation of his son Otho II. as his imperial successor. The second Otho had a short and troubled reign. On his accession (973), he had to subdue several of his vassals. After a war with the Slavonians and Bohemians, he undertook an expedition to Italy, with the intention of expelling the Greeks from the maritime places of the peninsula: these invoked the aid of the Saracens; and the emperor was signally defeated in Calabria. On his return to Lombardy, he ensured the imperial crown to his infant son, and soon died at Rome (983), at a critical time, when the Slavonic tribes had revolted, and when the Danes were pouring their predatory hordes into Saxony. Otho III., however, a minor, was consecrated by the archbishop of Mentz. Civil war ensued; finally, the young emperor, under the able guidance of the archbishop of Mentz, triumphed over all, and also over the Slavonians. He thrice went to Italy, to establish his domination over the Romans and the south of Italy, and that country became his tomb (1002). Otho III. ended the male posterity of Otho the Great; but a scion of the house of Saxony still remained in Henry, duke of Bavaria, who, in 995, had succeeded his father, Henry the Turbulent. This prince, after a disputed election, was crowned a second time at Aix-la-Chapelle, and is known in history, not only as Henry II., but as Saint-Heinrich; for he was canonised in consequence of his virtues. His reign was full of troubles, which did not permit him to exercise his feelings of justice and goodness for the advantage of his people. The king of Poland was one of the most troublesome of his enemies, along with his Germanic vassals. Unfortunately, Henry was too pacific for his times, and thus the wars were protracted during the greatest portion of his reign. He went thrice to Italy. He received from the Pontiff at Rome the imperial crown—vain ceremony—which gratified his devotion. Prior to his coronation by the Pope, he never styled himself emperor, but merely *king of the Romans*—an example followed by his successors.

The death of Henry II., in 1004, is also the extinction of

the house of Saxony, during which, despite the civil wars, and successes of the Slavonic tribes, the progress of the empire towards improvement was, on the whole, conspicuous. It acquired both extent and strength. The successes of the first Otho kept Europe in respect, whilst the policy of the first Henry, and his excellent internal regulations, had laid the foundation of future greatness.

The political constitution of the period is not very clear. The prerogatives of the emperor, the rights of the dukes and of the provincial states are not clearly enough defined; they are questions that have been fiercely debated, and, too often, in the zeal of party. We leave them in order to fix our attention on more satisfactory features. Slavery still existed, but mitigated by advantages unknown to former times. The slaves gradually arose in the social scale; they were rising to the rank of peasants; and the peasants to that of freedmen; the freedmen to comparative independence. In Germany, as everywhere else, Christianity, when once established, had its inevitable effect: it narrowed the gulf between man and man, by disposing the pious to mitigate the condition of their dependents, and by terrifying even the guilty, when lingering on the bed of death, into similar concessions.

A diet of election was convoked, and one of the counts of Franconia selected. The reign of Conrad II. (1024-1039) does not exhibit much to strike the attention. He endeavoured to augment the royal authority by weakening the great lords and dukes, and strengthening the inferior feudatories. Bavaria and Suabia remained in the royal family. Italy made an attempt to become independent, but failed, and Conrad took the imperial crown. The most important fact of his reign was the acquisition of the kingdom of Arles, by inheritance; which, however, ever remained foreign to Germany in manner and feelings. The administration of Conrad was wise and firm. His son, Henry III. (1039), continued his work. He had had the good fortune not only to be elected, but to be crowned during his father's life. His first exploits were over the Bohemians and Hungarians. He maintained the imperial

ascendancy in Italy. Rome had then three Popes. Henry caused Clement II. to be elected; and the necessity of the imperial sanction was renewed and acknowledged. At this time commenced the first reforms, that were to end in the exaltation of Papal control. Leo IX. and Hildebrand were then masters of the chair of St. Peter. Henry III. died prematurely, at the age of thirty-nine, with the respect of all Europe. His successor was soon to experience the new vigour of the spiritual authority (1056).

The administration of the counts had continued in Lombardy after the decline of the Carolingian empire; an extensive military population obeyed its chiefs. Under the Othos, a modification took place, which laid the foundation of the greatness of the Italian cities: most of the bishops obtained the *immunity*, namely, the privilege granted by the emperor of being themselves judges on their own territories, instead of the counts. Gradually, the bishops assumed an almost absolute right of sovereignty; the military vassals fell under their jurisdiction, and mixed with the freemen; and soon the cities, governed by them with great firmness and wisdom, became enlarged and powerful. The citizens were divided into three classes: the captains, or feudal chiefs; the vassals; and the free citizens. Those three classes enjoyed the important privileges of appointing the *consuls*, or *judges*, who exercised a kind of control over the episcopal authority; and, below all, existed the working class, divided into corporations, but without any privilege or rights whatever. The *consuls* became the authors of the municipal organisation of the cities; they were the representatives of the citizens: and taking advantage of the factions and rivalries in the cities for the election of the bishops, or between these and the imperial party, they subsequently found themselves in possession of the whole sovereignty; then were formed all those free constitutions of the cities, the history of which, however, is obscure as to their basis and tenure. In the meantime, the fiefs were becoming hereditary, in spite of the opposition of the bishops. At the time we are speaking of, therefore, the North of Italy was

composed of independent fiefs ; and the centre of Lombardy possessed many flourishing cities, among which stood pre-eminent, Milan, Pavia, Lodi, Cremona, Padona, Verona, Brescia. The exarchate of Ravenna was in the same state. Tuscany formed a principality in the hands of the Countess Mathilda.

Southern Italy had undergone great changes. The maritime cities were Greek colonies and independent republics, with a chief magistrate, who was called Duke. They acknowledged the nominal sovereignty of the emperor of the Greeks. Those of Gaeta and Naples were flourishing. Amalfi was the Queen of the South ; her prosperity and commerce could not be rivalled. The Lombards of Beneventum had remained impregnable in their mountains. Those states were often at variance and at war. Little is known about the dramatic episodes of their rivalry, and especially about the constitution of each. However, they soon had to oppose a formidable foe—the Arabs, known here as the Saracens, who were often accepted reluctantly as auxiliaries, when their expulsion could not be effected by the force of arms.* In 1016, about forty Norman adventurers, returning from a pilgrimage, landed in Italy, and defeated, it is said (or must have helped in the defeat of), an army of Arabs. They were richly rewarded. Other Normans, enticed by the fabulous reports of their successes, followed them, and with them the twelve sons of Tancred of Hauteville. Robert Guiscard was their chief. He at first assisted the Greeks in expelling the Saracens, but soon turned against them also, and drove away from Italy both the Arabs and Greeks. His younger brother, Roger, arrived to join his successful brothers, and conquered Sicily after the most romantic adventures that can enliven the pages of history. The Normans extended, and firmly established themselves in, their newly-acquired dominions. Pope Leo IX., fearing their progress, called against them German troops : they were all defeated ; but the Normans understood how much their conquest would be secured by the spiritual sanc-

* See Appendix, No. V. (a.)

tion of the head of the church ; they consented to do homage to the chair of St. Peter, and to recognize all their possessions as fiefs of the Holy See, and Papacy ever afterwards found in them powerful and faithful supporters.

Such was the state of Italy when Henry IV., though only in his sixth year, was recognised as his father's successor, without obstacle (1056). We must pass over all the intrigues and dissensions that attended his minority. A detestable education allowed a free scope to his bad passions. They had no check. He had married an Italian princess, and sought a divorce. He oppressed the Saxons, who raised the standard of revolt, and forced him to yield, whilst he had the mortification to be menaced with excommunication by the Pope, if he did not retain his consort. Henry replied by deposing Gregory VII. in a national council ; but being himself excommunicated, all Germany rose in arms against him. The sovereign, thus forsaken and defeated, came to implore the pity of the Pope, who kept him three days waiting bare-foot in the ditches of his fortress of Canossa, during bitter cold weather. Thus Henry procured a humiliating absolution ; but he returned to Germany with the worm of vengeance gnawing his heart. His princes had rebelled ; they deposed him, and elected in his place his brother-in-law, Rudolf, duke of Suabia. After several battles, Rudolf was defeated and slain ; yet the opposition of the Pope could not be shaken ; a new anti-Cæsar was soon elected, and the civil war renewed ; it raged with greater fury than before. At last, Henry IV., master of the whole of the north of Italy, besieged Gregory in his castle of St. Angelo. Robert Guiscard and his Normans came in time to save the Pope ; Hildebrand, in his turn, had the humiliation to fly before his mortal foe ; he took refuge at Salerno, where he soon died (1085).

Nevertheless, the war continued. After a struggle of twenty years, Henry triumphed over the Saxons ; but the Suabians refused to submit, and they even elected his eldest son, Conrad, in his place. Again the veteran emperor was victorious ; he forced all Germany to be pacified ; his son,

declared guilty of high treason, soon perished. The alliance of Welf, duke of Bavaria, with Tuscany, had none of the results expected. But the old emperor was too empty to the dregs the cup of ingratitude, the result of his own vices. His second son, Henry, also rebelled, wrested the sceptre from his hands, and forced him to retire to Liege, where he died, wanting the necessaries of life, the very year after his deposition (1106).

Henry V. was no sooner master of the imperial dignity, than he followed the steps of his father, in resisting the pretensions of the Holy See. Pope Pascal renewed the declarations against investiture, absolutely prohibiting every ecclesiastic, of whatever grade, to do homage to a layman. Henry replied by open violence; he passed the Alps with a most formidable army, hastened to Rome, and forced the Pope to important concessions. Under Calixtus II., the war was renewed, but at last ended by the Concordat, or Conference of Worms. Henry's government, on the whole, was unfortunate; he had undertaken wars against the Hungarians and Poles, in which he was defeated. He left no legitimate offspring. With him ended the male line of the house of Franconia, which had occupied the throne a full century (1125). The election of a new dynasty became indispensable. A diet was convoked at Mentz. Two families were then powerful above all others: that of Welf, the ancient ducal House of Bavaria, and that of the Hohenstauffen, related to the late imperial dynasty, and invested with the duchy of Suabia: both gave umbrage to the electors, who made choice of Lothar, duke of Saxony. But Lothar forming a close alliance with the Welf, Henry, duke of Bavaria, his reign was almost totally filled by a civil war with the Hohenstauffens. At last he restored peace, and evinced great condescension for the Holy See. The unexpected death of Lothar II. (1138), without male issue, again opened a door to ambition, and, what is worse, to internal disorders.

This time, Conrad III., of Hohenstauffen, was elected king of Germany; but his election was declared illegal by Henry,

duke of Bavaria, to whom Lothar, his father-in-law, had left his duchy of Saxony. The war broke out. Henry's sway extending from the Baltic to the confines of Lombardy, rendered him too dangerous a candidate for the imperial crown ; indeed, as a vassal of the empire, he was too formidable, and Conrad, eager to ruin him, summoned him to restore one of his two duchies. In this war is heard, for the first time, the denomination of the two parties so celebrated in the wars of the Middle Ages—that of the *Guelfs* (from Welfs), the enemies of the imperial authority, and given indiscriminately to all, whether German or Italian, which therefore naturally became also that of the Papal party ; and that of *Ghibellins* (from Weiblingen, an ancient seat of the Hohenstauffens), belonging to all the defenders of the imperial prerogatives. The duke of Bavaria was defeated several times, and lost his duchies, but his son re-conquered Saxony. Conrad, having pacified Germany, listened to the preaching of St. Bernard, and was induced to assume the cross. He departed for the Holy Land, with the flower of Teutonic chivalry. His exploits were of no avail ; the perfidy of the Greeks, the quarrels and licentiousness of the chiefs, rendered the expedition most disastrous. On his return, he found Germany convulsed by the ambition of the Guelf duke. He triumphed again over him, seized his dominion, and died as he was preparing an expedition into Italy to receive the imperial crown from the Pope, recommending that the crown should pass to his nephew, Frederic Barbarossa, duke of Suabia (1152).

Frederic I. commenced by ensuring peace to Germany, and in this view he restored part of Bavaria to Henry the Lion, having taken a portion of it, in favour of Austria, erected into a duchy. Then he prepared to invade Italy, in order to annihilate the Papal control and ruin the liberties of the Italian cities. These republics of Lombardy had grown highly prosperous, and deeply animated by an ardent spirit of liberty ; the wars they had waged against each other had enhanced the consciousness of their power, and hardened them to the dangers and sufferings of warfare. Their cause was closely allied

to that of the Holy See, then also in its zenith of splendour and power. Frederic considered both as an encroachment on the imperial dignity, and consequently abhorred both. As successor of Constantine and Charlemagne, Italy was, in his eyes, a province submitted to Germany, and the Pope the servant of the emperor, as under the Othos. After several discussions with the Holy See, Frederic entered Italy, in 1154, with an army, and proclaimed the imperial prerogatives in a great assembly held at Roncaglia. All the municipalities were abolished, and imperial governors were established everywhere. A great fermentation ensued. Italy rose and resisted triumphantly: Frederic escaped over the Alps with difficulty. A second expedition seemed to be more successful; but soon the wrath of the Italians knew no bounds, and now a long, cruel war commenced;—the details of the heroic resistance of the Lombards must be read in Sismondi's *Italian Republics*. Milan had been totally destroyed by the implacable Frederic; Verona then became the centre of the league. The genius and activity of Pope Alexander III. conducted the war. Finally, the great battle of Legnano decided between the two parties. The emperor, being defeated, yielded; the cities preserved their liberties; the articles of a new treaty were signed at the diet of Constance (1182). Civil wars, in the meantime, had spread desolation in Germany. The family of the Welfs had lost Bavaria and Saxony; the former fell into the hands of Otho of Wittelsbach, and the latter became the possession of Bernard of Brandebourg. Bohemia was erected into a kingdom, and continual wars repelled the wild tribes of the North. Frederic Barbarossa, at an advanced age, undertook a crusade, from whence he never returned (1190).*

His son, Henry VI., succeeded him. The only important event of his reign was the acquisition of Naples and Sicily, to which he succeeded in right of his wife Constanza. His conduct to the Italians is said to have been savage, and the premature death of Henry left the suspicion that it might have

* See Appendix, No. V. (b.)

been the result of a vengeance on the part of Constanza, a Sicilian and warm patriot (1197).

Henry VI. left a son, a minor. The regency was entrusted to Philip, duke of Suabia, uncle of the young prince. Germany and the Pope Innocent III. opposed to him Otho of Brunswick. A civil war was the inevitable result; it extended over all Germany and Italy, and, success attending the arms of Philip, he was himself crowned emperor. From this time especially dates in Italy the factions of Guelfs and Ghibellins, or of Papal and Imperial parties. Nothing could exceed their fury; hostilities, bloodshed and desolation were raging incessantly;—countries, cities, and even families, were often divided into two camps. The Hohenstauffens, first cause of these factions, had ceased to exist—the family of the Welfs also; yet during three centuries longer, Italy was convulsed by sanguinary divisions between the Guelfs and the Ghibellins.

Although Philip was crowned, Otho scorned to submit, and his hopes were raised on the assassination of Philip (1208). These hopes were not unfounded; there was a general longing for peace, and Otho IV. was unanimously chosen. At his consecration by the Pope, he granted all the Pontiff's requests. But, once crowned and firmly seated on the throne, he turned suddenly against the Pope; he claimed Tuscany, and the homage of Naples and Sicily; he even marched on Rome to threaten Innocent III. But he had himself sealed his own fate; Innocent raised a strong party against him in Germany, deposed Otho, and Frederic of Sicily, son of Henry VI., was invited to ascend the throne of his ancestors. Otho had still a considerable party; he watched narrowly for his rival in the defiles of the Alps. Lombardy was also hostile to the adventurous heir of the Hohenstauffens. However, Frederic, followed by his partisans and 30,000 Arabs, his faithful guard, reached Constance, after hair-breadth escapes that equal the fictions of romance, and soon after was solemnly proclaimed. Otho retired from the contest (1212).

For some years Frederic II. lived on good terms with the church, but he soon became one of the most implacable ene-

mies of the Holy See. A mortal struggle begins anew between Germany and Italy—between the Emperor and the Pope. We must pass over those scenes of disorder and bloodshed. Frederic had not adhered to his promise of not uniting Sicily to Germany; he had engaged to undertake a crusade, and, despite of the Papal threats, he delayed it during twelve years; at last he embarked, but, instead of sailing for Palestine, he landed in the kingdom of Naples, to re-establish his authority. Frederic was excommunicated; he nevertheless started at last for the crusade. He negotiated a truce with the sultan of Egypt, obtained the partial surrender of Jerusalem, entered the holy city, and there crowned himself. On his return to Europe, he forced the Pope to a reconciliation, but all the Italian cities, supported by the Pope, revolted against the imperial oppression. During fifteen years a terrible war ravaged Italy. The emperor exercised the most fearful cruelties against the vanquished, yet some of the Italian princes in his service, and, above all, the ferocious Ezzelino di Romano, exceeded his vengeance. The Popes continued the struggle; at last, in a council held at Lyons (1245), Frederic was solemnly excommunicated again, and deposed. Germany was stirred up to revolt. An anti-Cæsar was elected king of the Romans. The emperor vowed an exterminating war against the chief of the church; he hung the priests who refused to celebrate the divine offices; and by his son Conrad, the anti-Cæsar was defeated and mortally wounded. In revenge, the Pope proclaimed a crusade against him; both in Germany and Lombardy the war had assumed a vindictive and ferocious character. In the midst of the general conflagration, Frederic breathed his last (1250).

The time which elapsed from the death of Frederic II. to the accession of Rodolf I. of Hapsburg (1250-1273) is regarded as an interregnum, though partial elections took place, and nominal emperors were appointed. The war continued perpetually in Germany and Italy; it terminated by the extinction of the race of the Hohenstauffens—it led to the independence of Italy, as well as of the chair of St. Peter, and to

the establishment of a new royal house in Sicily. Conrad, son of Frederic, had to oppose the anti-Cæsar and the church, but he took the crown of Sicily, and found an early grave in Italy. His bastard brother, Manfred, seized upon Naples and Sicily, ostensibly to secure them for his nephew, little Conradin (*Conradino*), to whom Suabia had been left; but the Pope invited Charles of Anjou, brother of St. Louis, to the conquest of the Two Sicilies. A decisive battle was fought near Beneventum, in which Manfred perished, and the house of Anjou became possessed of Naples and Sicily, besides the rich territories of Provence. Afterwards, when young Conradin, the last of the Hohenstauffens, emerged from his obscure and private life in Suabia, to claim, at the head of a feeble army, the inheritance of his ancestors, Charles had him easily overpowered and taken; he treated him as a rebellious subject, and the young prince was publicly beheaded on a scaffold (1268).* In Germany, the anti-Cæsar William of Holland died without restoring order and tranquillity. Afterwards, a double election placed on the throne two foreign princes,—Richard of Cornwall, brother of Henry III. of England, and brother-in-law of Frederic II.; and Alfonso (Alonzo) X. of Castille. The latter never appeared in Germany; the former rarely came to it. A new election became necessary, but the great princes and electors were coveting the dignity, and throwing continual obstacles in the way: at last, the pontifical authority interfered, and suggested the election of a prince who, in an inferior station, had acquired much local celebrity. Accordingly, the suffrage fell on Rodolf, count of Hapsburg (1273).

During the reigns of the Germanic princes whom we have rapidly mentioned, the constitutions of Germany and Italy underwent numerous modifications. In Italy, the cities had never ceased to increase in population and prosperity; those of Tuscany had joined the republics of Lombardy, and among them Sienna, Florence, and Pisa, above all, stood pre-eminent.

* See Appendix, No. V. (c.)

Two celebrated cities, Genoa and Venice, had derived great advantages from the crusades, and had become highly flourishing. In the constitution of the cities of Lombardy, two modifications especially had taken place during the Hohenstauffens. In the first place, the body of the ancient consuls became chiefs of the republic, and was divided into two classes—the consuls *communi*, who were municipal magistrates, and the consuls of *placitis*, who became the judicial magistrates; secondly, the cities, in order to obviate the partiality of the local administrators in favour of their own patrimony, family, or friends, selected a supreme magistrate, generally a stranger to their city, elected annually with the title of *Podestat*. This new dignity gradually acquired a great ascendancy in the cities. But nothing could remedy the evils caused by the long anarchy that afflicted Italy. Her disorders favoured the already predominating influence of a turbulent aristocracy. The fairest days of Italian liberty were gone by; this liberty was now degenerated into a vicious federalism, devoid of a central authority, of vital principles, and of bonds of unity; and it was soon replaced by another federalism, formed by the despotic tendencies of the lords.

In Germany, great changes had also taken place; feudalism had commenced when the little fiefs had become hereditary. Soon, the emperors had been obliged to render the duchies and great fiefs hereditary also. The former organisation was totally changed; two only of the ancient duchies still existed, Saxony and Bavaria; but several small, independent principalities had risen at the expense of Saxony. Bavaria was divided into two branches. Ancient Franconia was now transformed into a palatinate, and in the extensive principalities of the bishops of Mainz, Cologne, and Treves. The houses of Hesse and Thuringia occupied ancient Thuringia. The duchy of Suabia became extinct with the Hohenstauffens, and over its ruins were seen the houses of Baden and Wurtemberg, and several others. Bohemia being united and powerful, and governed by a national dynasty, had been erected into a kingdom in 1204. The house of Guelf of Bavaria had submitted

and civilised the countries at the north of Saxony, and incorporated them with the patrimonial dominions. Prussia, long hostile to Christianity, had, in 1220, received the knights of the Teutonic order, who, after an obstinate struggle, became masters of the country.

The hierarchy of military functions no longer existed. The lords had made themselves independent, and only recognised the suzerainty of the empire. There existed, moreover, a numerous chivalry, composed of alodial proprietors or independent nobles; and the cities had grown—they had become imperial, and enlarged their municipalities. The history of the Germanic cities is somewhat obscure; in some points, it resembles those of Italy; they also developed themselves, protected by episcopal authority. Originally, four of the cities were imperial; the greater number were gradually called into existence, but they procured their exemption from feudal obligations by purchase rather than by open force. Innumerable are the charters in the archives of the German cities, placing this fact beyond dispute. They also had three classes of citizens—the free citizens; the *falburgers*, or external burgesses, bound to lend their services to the municipality; and the people, divided into corporations of trades. On the whole, the progress of events in Germany was favourable to the cities. If the nobles could combine, so could they; and they formed leagues, capable of bidding defiance, not merely to an elector, but to the whole empire. Thus, in 1256, about seventy cities, great and small, entered into a league to resist the newly-enfranchised lords of Franconia and Suabia, who were so many banditti, and whose attacks were peculiarly directed against the carriers of merchandise.

With reference to the cultivators of the ground, the serfs, their condition was ameliorated. Corporeal servitude had ceased throughout a great part of the empire; this assuredly was not owing to the increased humanity of the lords, but from causes of policy and interest, which demanded the amelioration of the condition of the peasantry, by which, at the same time, the serfs benefitted themselves. A remarkable

feature also of this period of Germanic history is the progress of *territorial jurisdiction*. The supreme jurisdiction was gradually wrested from the emperors; it enabled the princes to arrogate to themselves the cognisance of causes within their respective domains; the royal assizes gradually declined, and the emperor retained a court judge for certain defined cases. On the whole, the imperial authority declined considerably during this period, and its revenues diminished in an equal degree; the aristocracy had also usurped many of the most profitable privileges.

The *Crusades* form also a conspicuous feature in the political activity of the Christian nations during the Middle Ages. The great religious movement that induced Christian Europe to rush to the East, had, by no means, the expected results. The object in view was not obtained; yet, its consequences became numerous and beneficial. The crusades will eternally remain in history an example of the devotion and mighty efforts of which men are capable, when united by a common faith and religious ideas. Pope Gregory VII. was the first who conceived the project of a crusade, realised afterwards by his friend Urban II. The Seljukian Turks occupied Egypt, Syria, and Africa; Palestine and Jerusalem continued, nevertheless, to attract Christian pilgrims. Peter the Hermit, on his return from this pilgrimage, complained in terms full of wrath, of the grievances which the Christians suffered from the Turks.* Urban II. fixed on this enthusiast to commence the execution of the great design. Peter received the mission of preaching the crusade, and he excited the enthusiasm of the whole Christian world. He led 80,000 men under his banners, and they began their march towards the East; this disorderly mass wasted down, and what remained was cut to pieces. But a new host followed, led by illustrious commanders, with Godfrey of Bouillon at their head. They twice defeated the Turks; and, at length, reached Jerusalem, which, in 1099, they took by storm, and, with savage fury, massacred the

* See Appendix, No. V. (d.)

whole of its inhabitants. Godfrey was hailed king of Jerusalem, and the feudal system was transplanted to Asia. Many of the powerful knights founded feudal principalities at Edessa, Antioch, Tripoli, Tyre, Galilea, &c.: the rights of all were regulated by the *Assizes of Jerusalem*, one of the most curious remains of feudal law. The Asiatic churches were apparently on the point of being reformed, and Christianity ready to assume its legitimate ascendancy over the East.

Those brilliant hopes, however, were not to be realised. Jerusalem soon became so feeble, that monks, taking special vows of devotion, were embodied for its defence; hence arose the military orders of the Knights Templars and Hospitallers, and, soon after, the Teutonic order from the German pilgrims. Godfrey only reigned one year. His successors, during about half a century, were incessantly harrassed by the Mohammedans; their position at last had become desperate, when St. Bernard preached a new crusade in 1147. This time, Louis VII. of France, and Conrad III. of Germany, took their departure at the head of a numerous army; but both monarchs, after many disasters, returned with shame to their dominions. The petty Christian sovereignty of Jerusalem went on lingering, until it was overturned by the great Saladin (Salah-addin) in 1188. The successes of the illustrious sultan alarmed Europe. A third crusade was prepared in France, England, and Germany, and the armies of each were headed by their respective celebrated sovereigns, Philip-Augustus, Richard I., and Frederic Barbarossa. The emperor of Germany died in Asia, and his army smouldered to nothing. The kings of France and England were more successful; but they soon quarrelled, and the former returned to his country. Richard alone sustained the contest and defeated Saladin at Ascalon, but his army being reduced by famine and fatigue, he was forced to escape from Palestine with a single ship.

A fourth crusade was fitted out in 1202, under Baldwin, count of Flanders, but it failed in its object. Constantinople, embroiled by civil war and revolution, was besieged and taken by the crusaders, and Baldwin elected emperor. The

principal leaders shared the imperial dominions. The Venetians got the island of Candia. The Emperor Alexius founded a new sovereignty in Asia, which he termed the empire of Trebizond. A fifth crusade, in 1218, had for its object to lay waste Egypt; but partial success and ultimate ruin was the issue of this expedition. The events of the Holy Land were always followed in Europe with an ardent sympathy. In 1202 upwards of 80,000 youths of different countries left their parents in order to betake themselves to the Holy Land. Cold, famine, disease, and captivity, became the fate of all; none ever returned home.

The expedition of Frederic II., as alluded to in our sketch of the Germanic affairs; his truce of ten years, by which he got partial possession of Jerusalem,—cannot be reckoned among the crusades. The Mohammedans soon recovered all; the religious zeal for the crusades was no more; and, moreover, the Christian princes who were in Syria, or who came there with European troops, were divided by internal dissensions. Only two more attempts were made by St. Louis; they both failed, both attended with unheard-of misfortunes, which did not shake the constancy of the holy king; and the Holy Land was finally lost. The last expedition of St. Louis, in which he died, was against Tunis (1270). In the meantime Prince Edward of England was equally unfortunate. The Christians continued to possess a few cities in Syria, and the nominal crown of Jerusalem came to the Anjous of Sicily.

Such was the conclusion of those crusades, during which two millions of Europeans were buried in the East. The crusades, although failing, as stated, in their main end, were nevertheless abundantly fertile of varied results. One of the objects of the Popes was, no doubt, to spend and exhaust, in a distant land, the turbulent energy of the military population of Europe, which threatened the progress of civilisation—in this they fully succeeded: and also to enable the different races of Europe to know each other better, and to banish all mutual hostility, by uniting in one same devotion to the Christian faith. Another great consequence of the

crusades was the change of territorial property, the sale of the estates of the nobles, and their division among a number of smaller proprietors. Hence the feudal aristocracy was weakened, and the lower classes began to acquire weight, along with a spirit of independence. Many towns purchased also their immunities, and ever afterwards were governed by their own municipal laws. The church gained also by taking a good share in the spoils of the nobility.

With reference to the empire of the East, it continued to present the same lifeless history, the same pompous, demoralised, intriguing court, in which the changes of reigns and dynasties are marked by murders and civil wars. This monotony is interrupted by the conquest of the French and Venetian crusaders, who took Constantinople by storm in 1203. Baldwin of Flanders was the first of the emperors of the *Latin empire*, at Constantinople; his successors had no military means of maintaining their dominion, and the Greek people had the Latins in abhorrence. The native emperor had made Nicea the capital of their empire. Finally, one of them, Michael Paleologus, crossed the Hellespont with a small army; the whole population rose in his favour. Constantinople was soon re-taken, and the French or Latin empire vanished, after a duration of fifty-seven years (1261).

The civilisation, springing from Christianity, advanced during this period, with an infinite variety of forms, and a constantly changing aspect. We must name its prominent features.

The church is distinguished by two characterising facts in her internal organisation: the extensive augmentation of the pontifical authority, and the reforms as well as the creation of convents. The Pope had become an universal bishop; all ecclesiastical elections were under his control; but it must be acknowledged that this supreme ascendancy was employed in checking and humbling the pretensions of a proud ecclesiastical aristocracy, and in protecting the lower clergy—the popular masses of the convents. We have spoken of the decline and corruption of the convents; but, at the very commencement of the tenth century, great efforts were made in all directions

to remedy such a state of things ; and, among them, the new establishment of the celebrated houses of Cluny (930), and more especially of the convent of Citeaux (1098), the design of which was to restore the pristine regularity of the monastic life. In this they were successful ; they soon acquired general favour, and became the objects of the lavish liberality which had both enriched and corrupted the houses of St. Benedict. St. Bernard is the most illustrious name of Citeaux ; his virtues and high attainments exercised an incredible influence on his age ; the persuasive energy of his eloquence worked wonders. Conrad, the first of the Hohenstauffens, after having heard him, could not resist it ; and he took the cross for his unfortunate expedition. The influence which St. Bernard possessed throughout Europe seemed unbounded : his dictates were received as a law ; kings and princes listened with respectful obedience to his admonitions, as to the voice of heaven.

But neither the order of Cluny and Citeaux, nor the celebrated orders of chivalry, in existence since the crusades, would have sufficed for the purification of the church and the propagation of the Christian spirit. The peaceful labours of the cloister and rough efforts of the sword could not penetrate into the masses of that age, so deeply agitated by tumultuous passions. The object was fulfilled by the establishment of the Mendicant orders ; they deserve to be seriously studied because of their great influence, although we can only pause a moment before those of St. Francis and St. Dominic. Both these founders were men of uncommon religious enthusiasm ; simple in their language, gentle in their manners, patient of insults, forgiving injuries, and contemning wealth. They only supported themselves by the alms they received ; on no occasion ever accepted money. They were soon followed by zealous adherents, who shared their privations ; and all the members of the order travelled wherever their presence could be beneficial ; to attend on the sick, instruct the young, exhort the multitude. The people listened to their admonitions, and insensibly acquired habits of reflection. Their manners were humanised and their minds enlarged. The

preachers addressed them in the vernacular tongue. Public instruction, however, was more especially the end of the Dominicans ; their object was more particularly, also, to preach against the unfortunate Albigenses and the lax morals of the South.

The mendicant orders were the clergy of the poor. We find in them the Christian democracy ; whilst the convents of Cluny and Citeaux, for instance, represented absolute monarchy—or the Christian aristocracy. The convents formed also an hierarchy. The supreme chief of each order, whose function was elective, received the title of *General*, and resided at Rome. All these orders exercised, each in their sphere, a great civilising influence—the former more especially—on the people ; the latter, by their studies and literary labours, were preparing the revival of letters and the diffusion of knowledge in their own circle.

In the meantime the canonical legislation was continually improving, and the church, with her progressive constitution, unity and influence, continued to soften the manners of society, and pursued her efforts, which we have already seen, for a social transformation. Under the auspices of the church a system of Christian charity was established :—hospitals, schools for children, homes of refuge, were multiplied ; and the family ties and habits were also the object of the ecclesiastical solicitude. Assuredly all this was very beneficial ;—it was the warmth of Christian light. But deep and painful wounds existed, as may be seen ; and we shall subsequently expose their fatal consequences.

The feudal system somewhat changed its character after the crusades. The military functions and the possession of fiefs becoming hereditary, the nobility constituted itself on a deeper basis, and additional honour and consideration arose from the transmission of these dignities or estates—when these had been occupied by a series of ancestors ; so much so, that the possession of a fief during three successive generations gave a right to nobility, and even knighthood ennobled its possessor. And this faculty of the lords, of conferring knighthood, led to

a profusion of abuses towards the end of the crusades. A multitude of plebeians, who had purchased fiefs, were easily made nobles, and this class of *parvenus*, similar to that of our time, was by far the most arrogant, proud and intolerant portion of the privileged society. The abuse, however, went so far, that it was at last ordained that the king alone should have the right of conferring knighthood. Many varied distinctions inflated the pride of the aristocracy; their mutual petty jealousies absorbed their faculties; one of those minute distinctions has been the origin of heraldry—a science as it is called by many—which the antiquary and historian are often obliged to consult.

Chivalry also, has often been considered as a consequence of the crusades: but it no doubt belongs to a more ancient date; it was in its full splendour at the time of the first crusade, which, without this institution, could not, we believe, have been put into execution. The Pope and Priests would have preached in vain. Chivalry must have originated during the great invasions of the Arabs in Spain and France. Chivalry is a mixture of the fidelity and sentimental nature of the Teuton, with the fairy-elegant nature of the Arab, clothed with the form of Christianity and animated by its spirit. There is something obscure in the origin and progress of chivalry, which places the student on the limit between reality and fiction; he is attracted and deceived by romance and poesy, through which he wanders enchanted in a fairy land; or he is deceived into the contrary extreme by the dry chronicles of the time—by the heartless narrators, incapable of conceiving of those events which belonged to the realm of sentiment or imagination.

All the classes of nobility and of chivalry displayed great ostentation in their person. The industry of the cities was occupied almost exclusively for them and the clergy. The manufactures consisted in church ornaments, jewels, tapestry, sacerdotal attires, arms, furniture, harness, and the clothing materials for the princes and nobles. Many cities also had manufacturers of linen, cloth, wool, and leather. The commerce of the time was, moreover, much greater than could be

supposed. The harbours of Italy, especially Venice, Genoa, and Pisa, received from Egypt all the provisions of the East, and sent back the products of their own peninsula. Marseilles and Barcelona were their rivals, whilst, in the North, Lubeck, Breme, and Hamburgh, were the intermediary points of commercial intercourse between Russia, Poland, the Scandinavian States, and the South of Europe. Troyes, in France, was the great dépôt of the commerce of the Mediterranean, as well as of the products of the rich manufacturing cities of the north of France and of Flanders; but it lost its importance when the traders passed the strait of Gibraltar, and landed at Antwerp and London. In the centre of Germany—Ratisbon, Augsbourg, Nuremberg, and Vienna, were the great points of commercial junction between the North and Italy; and, by the Danube, brought Constantinople in communication with the Rhine.

We have stated that the land was cultivated by the serfs. When their fate was ameliorated and slavery abolished, when the civil wars and the rapines of the nobles ceased, agriculture flourished enough to prevent the fearful famine that had ravaged Europe during the tenth and eleventh centuries. Personal slavery had been abolished in France during the eleventh century. In Germany domestic slavery only disappeared in the fourteenth century, and the condition of the serfs remained as hard as that of the slave. In Italy, Spain, and England, [the abolition of slavery belongs to a much later period. We have said enough to give an idea of the state of society during the Middle Ages. Outrageous distinctions tarnished its organisation: the family of a lord was divided into three classes; the one prayed, the other fought, and the third worked, worked, and worked. Great efforts were yet to be made before the admission of anything like Christian principles into the social state.

This portion of the third period of the Christian civilisation, which we have explored, offers a rich and most remarkable development of the artistical faculties. The *civil* or *military* architecture, consisting in the castles of the nobility, raised everywhere for their defence and residence, did not offer any ele-

gance in their construction, nor any display of the finer arts which decorated the monasteries and the churches; they were only scowling oppression and defiance, and were often the seats of rapacity and the repositories of plunder. But Christian art reached its highest perfection, and left far behind all the productions of antiquity. The catholic cathedral, or *catholic* architecture, so improperly called *Gothic*, is the glory of the Middle Ages.* We cannot describe the innumerable beauties of those monuments, expressive of the faith of our ancestors, and the pride of so many of our European cities. But when, in the contemplation of those mysterious and striking frontings, so beautifully embroidered with the chisel, or in the silent and magnificent naves of those cathedrals, while the swelling organ invites to pious meditation—every one may, even now, experience those deep emotions which they were destined to produce. The religious sentiment had been hitherto confined in heavy, massive, shapeless churches, or in the gloomy convents; it burst out suddenly with freedom, pride, and glee: broad lozenges, with richly-painted glasses, representing a peacock's tail, and bold magnificent windows, admitting, abundantly, the luxuriant rays of the sun, transformed their resplendent blaze in endless fantastical flames. Without, the cathedral presents the image of an aviary, or of a menagerie richly furnished with indigenous and exotic animals: such as apes, parrots, crocodiles, dragons, &c., eccentric images, mysterious treasures imported by the crusaders.

The spirit of the times is carved and chiselled on the ecclesiastical monuments of the Middle Ages; that architecture was something akin to our liberty of the press, with all its caprices, sarcasms, and ironical sneers. Architecture, with all its grandeur, assumed a strange licentiousness. Until the fifteenth century, all ideas had no language but marble and granite. It is the art-sovereign—universal—speaking to the eyes, to the mind, to the heart and imagination. The multi-

* See Appendix, No. V. (e.)

tude of details in the workmanship has no doubt a symbolic signification, yet imperfectly known. There must have existed a general system of symbols expressing the rules of the dogmas, and a moral sense, forming a system secretly transmitted to the architects and workmen. This great revolution in architecture commenced during the twelfth century. Later, its influence manifested itself in civil architecture, and the palaces of princes and the town-halls were re-constructed after new models.

Very little reflection is required to be convinced that those magnificent structures were inspired by a fervent aspiration towards heaven. It is that which gives to the architecture of the Middle Ages the moving, religious, meditative character, which would be sought in vain in the purer models of the ancient as well as their modern imitations.* The treasures absorbed by the cathedrals and churches were furnished by the king, the clergy, the nobility, the people—all contributed; many condemned themselves to privations, in order to aid the consummation of the pious structure. All the arts found their places in the cathedral, and were consequently warmly encouraged;—painting, sculpture, music, advanced under the auspices of religion. The public worship no longer satisfied the sentimental ardour of the people, and it assumed in its ceremonies that degree of Pagan splendour and magnificence so well known.

One branch of art was not in direct communication with the church—namely, the vernacular literature. It is the time of the formation of the modern languages of Europe. The corrupt Latin of the Roman province had disappeared; the German and Italian languages were assuming their native form. The *langue d'oïl* of the north of France was approaching its destination, namely, the French language; the *langue d'oc* of the south, closely connected with the Catalan, was flourishing, and engendered all the local *patois* that were to survive it. France was, in many respects, the centre of the literary move-

* See Appendix, No. V. (f.)

ment of Europe. Through the Normans, her language and poetry were implanted in England and Sicily; they were imitated by Germany, whilst the Provençal poetry was naturalised in Italy and Spain. The Provençal is allowed by Tiraboschi to have been first applied to literary purposes. Nothing can exceed the variety and sprightliness of the literature of this period. The *Trouvères* (Trouveur) of the North, and *Troubadours* of the South, were poets, fablers, romancers, who re-produced the historical traditions and explored the diversified scenes of common life, abounding with the severest ridicule of persons and things the most highly estimated and most generally revered. They diffused a taste for letters, and their *gay science* was the faithful companion of chivalry.

The German dialects had also been developed; the high-ancient German spoken in the South—in Suabia, Bavaria, and Thuringia—had become the literary and official language; the lower German—namely, the Saxon and North-west dialects—gradually became mixed with the idiom of the South, or gave birth, by another mixture, to the Dutch, English and Scandinavian languages. The court of the Hohenstauffens became the cradle of Germanic poetry. The German poets re-produced also the national traditions; the most celebrated of their poems of that period, the *Nibelungen*, has Attila for one of its heroes, and its subjects are found also in the Scandinavian *Sagas*. German poetry declined when the protection of the princes began to fail; and towards the close of the thirteenth century arose the citizen poets, the *Meistersunger*. Then poetry became a trade, very productive in quantity, but scanty in quality.

Catalonia and Arragon were united to the south of France by feudal ties and a community of language; there, also, the light, satirical poetry of the troubadours was universally cultivated. In the meantime, in the north of Italy, under the influence of the Provençal and the remains of the Latin, the Italian language assumed its primitive form; then it improved rapidly under the influence of the political movements of the cities and the mental activity of the people. It was yet,

however, rude and inharmonious, when, in the thirteenth century, the great poetical star of Italy, Dante, fixed the language by giving it, in his *Divine Comedy*, all the purity and energy attainable on earth, whilst he left to his country one of the few imperishable monuments of human genius. "Dante," says Mr. Carlyle, "is the spokesman of the Middle Ages; the thought they lived by stands here in everlasting music."

The intellectual progress of the Middle Ages, we have seen, was chiefly the work of the clergy. We have spoken of their foundation of schools, at the end of the eleventh century; they subsequently acquired the more dignified name of *Universities*; that denomination was given, at least, to those schools which professed to embrace *all* the sciences within their walls. The University of Paris is said to have been the first established. Oxford, however, is older, I believe. The example was soon followed in other countries, and the Universities of Bologna and Toulouse became celebrated for the study of the Roman law; those of Salerno and Montpellier for their medical schools. Paris remained the centre for theological and philosophical studies and controversies. There was created and developed the method, special to the Middle Ages, known in history by the name of *Scholasticism*. This was a new method that had grown out of the sober rules established by the great masters in theology. It was the dialectic art, rendered complicated and mysterious by metaphysical terms and subtleties, applied, as a test of truth, to every subject, and particularly to those of religion. Neither religion nor philosophy could be benefitted by this amalgamation. The learned doctors did not endeavour to elucidate truth, or to promote its interests, but to perplex, by elaborate and abstruse distinctions—at all times evincing an imperturbable obstinacy. No attention was paid to the realities of nature, nor to the operations of the human mind, but the wildest fictions and the most palpable sophisms were employed for the defence of all sorts of errors. In the meantime, the philosophy of Aristotle came into general vogue, and acquired high estimation, and gradually obtained the ascendancy in the

schools, which it long maintained despite its extravagance, although occasionally checked by men of sober discernment, who beheld the fatal use to which its perverted precepts were applied.

The scholastic philosophy of this epoch was characterised by two opposite tendencies ; one party appealed exclusively to sentiment and faith, and became the origin of the mystical school ; the other party, especially devoted to the dialectic art, confined all things within the limits of reason and argument ; the latter was again subdivided into *Nominalists* and *Realists* ; the first affirming that the primordial or essential forms of things were nothing more than general notions formed by mental abstraction, and expressed by words ; the latter, that they had, on the contrary, a *real* existence, independently of intellectual conception. The question branched out into a variety of nice and impalpable distinctions, and they long continued to occupy the scholars of the period. William of Champeaux was at the head of the *Realists* ; but Abelard, the *Nominalist*, began to lecture ; his eloquence brought hundreds of pupils round him ; and the school of his rival became deserted. The fame of Abelard was such, that, wherever he went, crowds followed him ; it was one of the most celebrated triumphs of eloquence and philosophy. But among his enemies, stood foremost the celebrated St. Bernard. To him, every deviation from the simple language of revealed truth was suspicious ; he abhorred the dialectic art and its subtleties. In his eyes, therefore, Abelard was justly dangerous and obnoxious. The great champion of *Nominalism* had often been represented as unsound in faith ; and the word alone of St. Bernard carried conviction with it. A storm gathered round Abelard ; he was assailed without mercy ; his friends grew cool, and by degrees deserted him ; he retired into Lower Brittany. Finally, his doctrine and propositions gave so much umbrage, that he appeared before a synod convened at Sens, where, however, he declined all defence, witnessed the condemnation of his errors, and was himself permitted to depart. This romantic figure of

the Middle Ages closed a life of glory and misfortune in 1142.

The commencement of the thirteenth century beheld the highest ascendancy of scholasticism, continued by the greatest men of those ages—Alexander Hales, Robert Grosstête, bishop of Lincoln, Vincent of Beauvais; also by Albertus Magnus, whose works filled twenty-one volumes *in folio*; by his still greater pupil, Thomas Aquinas, the *angelic* doctor, who sums up all the philosophy of the Middle Ages, one of the most gigantic minds that ever existed. By the side of him stood Bonaventure, a Franciscan friar, who studied with him, not forgetting his great rival, Duns Scotus, who owed his appellation of *subtle doctor* to his polemical acuteness, and who was deemed the oracle of the schools, because he had dared to controvert some positions with Thomas Aquinas. He revived with inextinguishable ardour the old disputes, which, after the death of both himself and Aquinas, were continued by their pupils, without any distinction, however, and scholasticism declined gradually, and finally became extinct.

Besides those scholastic disputes which divided the clergy, the church continued to be assailed by diverging opinions and doctrines, which Rome unjustly stigmatised with the name of heresies. Their authors, insensible, perhaps, to the civilising functions of a portion of the clergy, were merely alive to the vices of another portion of that body, and to abuses, many of which are inherent, generally, to any social state, and much more so at a period when feudalism and the church were in the fullest enjoyment of a boundless authority. Certainly, the so-called heresies, propagated during that period, proposed an order of things better and more democratical. It was the commencement of the eternal claims of the people, which begins only to be listened to in our time. But, on the other hand, they tended to overthrow all governments, every control, and to endanger all religious influence. Although the fierce, implacable, interested opposition they met with is far from our sympathies, and is deserving of repro-

bation, yet it must be confessed that the triumph of some of those heresies, at an epoch when the absence of enlightenment and of experience would have let loose all passions, might have been followed by consequences, perhaps, very fatal to the progress of civilisation. The Christian societies were then in their infancy. No doubt the discipline was harsh, often unjust, and it called forth symptoms of revolt among the most petulant, but a firm control was indispensable for the preservation of their unity: they required to be governed; and a government, however selfish and despotic, was better than none at all, until they attained their maturity, and became capable of governing themselves.

The sparks of heresies had been re-kindled in various ways. The heresy of Bulgaria, the Paulician sect, the gnostic visions, invaded Western Europe; the *Nominalists* became the enemies of the clergy. The most conspicuous, the boldest, the most logical and most celebrated foe of the Roman omnipotence during this period, is Arnold of Brescia. He had been the disciple of Abelard, and far from possessing the soft and flexible nature of his master, he proudly attacked some of the chief dogmas of the church, such as Baptism, the Trinity, the Eucharist, &c., but his *political* heresy was more the source of his fame and misfortunes. He quoted the declaration of Christ that his kingdom is not of this world, and maintained that temporal honours and possessions belonged to secular persons, and were incompatible with the spiritual functions of the successor of St. Peter and of the clergy in general, who ought to renounce their wealth and luxuries for a frugal life and spiritual labours. Arnold's doctrines, it may be easily guessed, were soon condemned by the church; he was, however, for some time, revered as a patriot, and came to Rome, where, during ten years, he kept the city in perpetual divisions. His faction was victorious, but not without rapine and violence, and effusion of blood; a cardinal was killed or wounded in the broils. At last the Romans yielded to their temporal and spiritual master, and Arnold was banished. He fled; Frederic Barbarossa, to gratify the Pope, ordered

Arnold to be given up to the Roman authorities. This martyr of freedom was burnt alive in the presence of a careless and ungrateful people; and his ashes were cast into the Tiber (1155).^{*} With his ashes his sect was dispersed, but his doctrines were partly revived in 1170 by Peter Valdo (Valdos, *Pierre de Vaud*), a Lyons merchant, who gave the example of absolute poverty and perfect virtue, contrasting with the wealth and scandalous luxuries of the age; he soon found himself at the head of a numerous sect, celebrated for its vicissitudes and fidelity to its tenets—the *Vaudois*. Beza, however, believes the *Vaudois* to be of much more ancient date, and that Valdo, on the contrary, took his name and tenets from them. All the heresies of this period found their expression and were somewhat summed up by that of the Albigenses, whose appalling destruction we beheld in the preceding chapter.[†]

Besides theology, the Roman law must not be forgotten in the intellectual movement of this period; it had never ceased to be the subject of legal studies; but during the twelfth century it became an object of general and ardent investigation; numerous commentators appeared, and endless dissertations and interpretations ensued. The effects of this return to the study of the Roman law on the civil institutions were similar to those of scholasticism on science. In many localities the Roman texts of the law were accepted as positive and immutable, so that the civil legislation tended to return to its former state at the time of the last Roman emperors; the consequences of this tendency belong to the subsequent period.

The other branches of science were not much cultivated. The Greek theories exercised, on the whole, a general sway,

^{*} See Appendix, No. V. (g.)

[†] The *Vaudois* were repeatedly persecuted, slaughtered, tracked like wild beasts, and expelled from France. Persecution increased their faith and power as usual. They spread in Bohemia, Savoy, Germany, and even in Italy, braving the Papal despotism. They were the harbingers of John Huss and Luther.

with the exception of a few generous and dissentient Christians. The domain of history continued to consist chiefly in annals and chronicles. Several cotemporary histories, however, are remarkable; among them, we must mention, William of Malmesbury; Peter of Blois; William of Tyre; Matthew Paris; Vital; Lambert of Aschaffenburg; Otto of Freisingen; and the most ancient French authors of prose historical writings—Villehardouin, Joinville, and the Chroniclers of St. Denys. The future progress of science was prepared by an indefatigable elaboration in the solitude of the convents. In the middle of the thirteenth century, Roger Bacon was the herald of all the discoveries of the fifteenth century. “The mind of Roger Bacon,” says Mr. Hallam (*Introd. to Lit. of Europe*, ch. ii. 33), to whose admirable work we refer for all the intellectual history of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, “was strangely compounded of almost prophetic gleams of the future course of science, and the best principles of the inductive philosophy, with a more than usual credulity in the superstitions of his own time.”

We have already seen many of the agencies and elements of Christian civilisation. We confine ourselves for the present to the study of their development in Central Europe, where they came to an earlier and fuller growth. On another occasion, we shall behold their progress in the north and south of Europe. Our task is only half terminated, and already we have seen violent revolutions—rancorous vengeance and dissensions—a complicated variety of opinions, of interested enterprises and unions, with a general brutality, and occasional gleams of Christian spirit; but all—let it be well remembered—all are the paths over which, according to the decrees of Providence, the social progress marks its rapid steps on earth.

CHAPTER VII.

Third Period continued.—Character of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.—State of Papacy.—Boniface VIII. (1294).—Decline of the Pontifical Influence.—Corruption of the Higher Clergy.—Schism.—Three Popes in 1409.—Council of Constance (1414).—John Huss and Jerome of Prague burnt.—Council of Basle (1431).—Savonarola.—France.—Philip the Fair (1285).—The States-General.—The Parliaments.—Reigns of Philip the Fair's Three Sons.—Philip of Valois (1328).—John (1350).—Miserable State of France.—The Jacquerie.—Charles V. (1364).—Charles VI. (1380).—Victory and Oppression of the Nobles.—Civil War.—Treaty of Troyes (1420).—Charles VII. (1424).—Joan of Arc.—Louis XI. (1461).—England.—Character of Edward I. (1272).—Progress of the Judiciary Institutions.—Wars.—Edward II. (1307).—Edward III. (1327).—Richard II. (1377).—The House of Lancaster.—The House of York.—Henry VII., Tudor (1485).—Henry VIII. (1509).—Germany.—Accession of Rodolf of Hapsburg (1273).—Adolf.—Albert I.—Henry VII. of Luxemburg (1308).—Lewis of Bavaria (1318).—Charles IV. (1347).—The Golden Bull.—Wenceslas (1378).—Robert (1400).—Sigismund (1410).—Albert II. (1438).—Frederic III. (1440).—Maximilian (1493).—The Hanseatic League.—Switzerland.—Italy.—Venice.—Genoa.—Pisa.—Lombardy.—Florence.—Rome.—Naples.—Remarkable Epochs.—Great Political Movements in Europe during the Fourteenth Century.

We do not yet bid adieu to the Middle Ages; they continue until the end of the fifteenth century; for, then only the European nations were firmly constituted—finally established; and then only the fair flower of civilisation began to bloom luxuriantly. Nevertheless, the portion of the Middle Ages, comprising the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, differs essentially from that which precedes; its characteristics are very distinct. The feudal system continues; the church preserves her spiritual control, along with the temporal authority

and the wealth which we have seen; the nobles with their fiefs and distinctions continue to have the same aristocratical pretensions; the municipalities are confined within the narrow limits of their walls; the poor serfs and peasants have not seen any amelioration to their thralldom and sufferings; in short, the general organisation has not changed much; but, notwithstanding this apparent stagnancy, an invisible revolution has taken place:—viz. a profound modification has worked its way in the human mind; and, moreover, a great change is manifest in the position of the higher powers, which leads to the formation of modern Europe.

As we are advancing in these outlines of Christian civilisation, the events become naturally more crowded, and, in consequence of their multitude, less important in their results. A great number of them are mere conflicts between ambition and egotisms, and often, indeed, impede the progress of civilisation instead of favouring it. We shall, therefore, in the infinite activity and movements of the European nations, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and in modern history, only dwell especially on those facts which characterise every epoch, and have propitiated the progress of humanity.

During this latter portion of the third period of Christian civilisation, the political movements and general progress were not identical in all the European nations. Italy became the magnificent centre of all intellectual life—the fatherland of all great poets, great artists, and eminent statesmen;—it became the seat of the splendid revival of intellectual activity. Yet, this age of dazzling grandeur left no lasting fruit, and Italy afterwards fell a protracted victim, and remained prostrate and breathless. France, on the contrary, in spite of a mortal struggle of a century, and extreme vicissitudes, attained in the end immutable and progressive results. In England, the royal authority succeeded in shaking off, partially, the control of the aristocracy; whilst in Germany, on the contrary, absence of unity and divisions continued, and the feudal aristocracy remained triumphant.

In the meantime, the democratical movement extended

gradually—at first invisibly. The citizens organised themselves, and formed a compact body; the rural populations having groaned so long, began to stir—they broke out in clamour, and finally appeared standing up in open revolt—maddened by a thirst of vengeance. But in the history that follows, we no longer meet with the same motives for action, as in the former ages, nor the same *naïveté* and morality in the masses. The social convulsions had grown more political than religious. On the other hand, egotism and corruption had penetrated deeper than ever among the higher classes, and the contagion had also, in some degree, penetrated among the people. Principles were no longer the stimulus to activity, but self-interest alone was the object of the social and individual movement, and the general progress became the result of open violence, instead of being encouraged by the interference of pacific means, and Christian consciousness of the higher powers. Nevertheless, morality and Christian faith still existed abundantly in the inferior classes, and were manifested by noble and holy sacrifices.

We beheld the rivalry between the two greatest powers in Christendom—Royalty and Papacy. The church—gorged with wealth, absorbed by her temporal interests, delirious with power and luxuries—neglected and scorned the sacred duties of moral control, and her spiritual mission. Hence, the decline of that body and the degradation of the chair of St. Peter. Now, kings assumed the ascendancy, leaving the Papal influence far below theirs, whilst, aided by the people, they humbled and undermined the feudal aristocracy. This was the time of the constitutional formation of the principal European nations.

After the death of Pope Nicolas IV., in 1293, the cardinals, long divided in two factions, for the election of his successor, at last fixed their choice upon a man belonging to neither party—a humble, pious hermit, universally revered—Celestin V. The new Pope was a true Christian—had none of the craftiness required for the political difficulties of the time; and, moreover, he was simple enough to endeavour to

reform the unchristian luxuries and ostentation of the cardinals. They soon put aside the pious Pontiff, who joyfully returned to his hermitage ; and Boniface VIII. ascended the chair of St. Peter (1294). Boniface has been accused of almost every infamy : all these accusations appear calumnious ; but he was violent and crafty—and he entertained unheard-of—almost insane—pretensions as Pontiff ; they caused his own ruin along with that of the legitimate prerogatives and salutary control of the head of the church.

Boniface presumed to interfere in a feudal war that had broken out between Philip the Fair, king of France, and the king of England, by peremptorily ordering them to make peace. Philip haughtily rejected this intervention. The Pope prohibited the clergy of France from paying an extraordinary contribution demanded by the king ; the latter in his turn, severely prohibited any exportation of gold and silver from France to Italy. Angry words and a rancorous quarrel ensued. Boniface resolved upon striking a decisive blow : he sent a legate to summon the king of France to obey the pontifical order. The legate was arrested. Then Boniface gave vent to his indignation. He issued a violent Bull, threatening the king of France, establishing his own supremacy, and announcing his intention of assembling a council in order to obtain a general reform in that kingdom. Philip, highly incensed, thought it prudent, however, to yield, at first ; but the states-general assembled in Paris, and protested with energy against the Papal pretensions. Boniface was on the point of launching a sentence of excommunication, when a party of French, sent to Rome, conducted by the Procureur Nogaret, and supported by the powerful Roman family of the Colonnas, surprised the Pope at Anagni. The proud Pontiff was ill-treated, outraged, smitten, and only escaped death through the intervention of the people of Anagni, who rose in his favour, delivered him, and had him hastily taken to Rome : but the unfortunate old man was guarded by his protectors ; he had lost all reason ; this protection seemed to him a new outrage, and he dashed his head against a wall (1303).

With the quarrel between Philip the Fair and Boniface commences the memorable discussion between the *Gallicans* and the *Ultramontanes*. The church of France claimed certain privileges known under the name of *Liberties of the Gallican Church*. The cavilling, argumentative tendency of the time invaded the parties, and complicated the question. On both sides the pretension was agitated in myriads of writings, all equally shallow and verbose. The question as to prerogative had not been clearly defined after all—nor received a formula in the thirteenth century, during the great quarrel between the Pope and the Emperor. The controversy now assumed a degree of legal vivacity which lasted for ages. Many exaggerations were assumed on both sides; the *Gallians* for the King, and *Ultramontanes* for the Pope. Both demanded such an unreasonable ascendancy, that the controversy became a dead letter: indeed, the question is not even decided in our time; but practical events and real facts decided much more effectually the question in favour of the royal authority.

The successor of Boniface, Benedict IX., reconciled immediately with Philip, and, as he soon died suddenly, the king of France, by dint of corruption, obtained the appointment of a Pope of his own choice—Clement V., who became a docile instrument in his hands, and who, in order to comply with his wishes, established the political residence at Avignon (1309). But Germany was, some years after, to renew the former contest with the Pontiff, and with results expressive of the progress of German independence. In 1314 a double election gave two pretenders to the empire—Lewis of Bavaria, and Leopold of Austria. During their war the Pope remained neuter, and, when victory had favoured Lewis, he excommunicated him, because Lewis had exercised some imperial prerogatives without being authorised by the Pontiff. Now commenced a struggle of twenty years between the Popes and Lewis; the latter had often submitted himself to the most humiliating conditions; but the pontifical court, excited by France, remained inflexible. In this case again,

Rome triumphed, it is true, and Lewis of Bavaria sunk under that exorbitant power; but, on the other hand, the pontifical, hard-hearted, stubborn conduct, gave rise to general indignation, and, as well as in France, the public opinion manifested itself by a solemn declaration of the States of Germany, which protested against the Papal pretensions.

Another circumstance awoke still more the public opinion against the pontifical prestige: dissensions had long existed in the order of the Franciscans with reference to the application, more or less rigid, of its regulations. An austere party had formed itself among them, desirous of imitating completely the austerity, excessive piety and self-denial of their holy master and founder. This party became soon known by the name of the *Spiritualists*; and, in truth, their mysticism aimed at nothing less than the regeneration of the church and the gospels; their virtues and poverty rendered them highly popular, whilst they incurred the rancorous hatred of the high clergy and the universities, who had always abhorred the Mendicant orders, and had succeeded in their strenuous efforts to have many of the Spiritualists persecuted and burnt as heretics. These Spiritualists had gone so far as to deny the clergy any right to property. The quarrel became vehement; it entered into the luxurious details of the high life of the ecclesiastical body. Pope John XXII., and the aristocracy of the clergy, baffled, defeated and crushed the Franciscans: but they gained nothing by it; the humble monks put themselves in the service of Lewis of Bavaria; they attacked openly the authority and the infallibility of the Pope, and prepared the ground for the doctrines of Wickliffe and John Huss. Their influence extended widely among the popular classes, and the people, judging as usual from the moral point of view, entertained a latent contempt for a corrupt clergy which was a daily perjurer to the faith it professed. Then the cry for reform became universal, and came also from the chair of St. Peter. The abuses, spoliations, and scandalous depravity of the court of Rome and the higher

clergy surpassed all that could be invented by the most fertile imagination in our time. Let us turn away from the loathsome details! But the church, thus gnawed by universal corruption, gave to the world an additional scandalous spectacle,—that of a schism, which lasted thirty-sixty years, with all its fatal consequences.

Pope Urban V. had left Avignon in 1367, and re-established the pontifical court at Rome. After three years he returned to Avignon. His successor, Gregory XI., had also settled in Italy, to comply with the wishes of the Italians; but he was preparing to return to France, when he died at Rome. The Romans thought this a good opportunity for obtaining an Italian Pope; a revolt broke out, and the cardinals, terrified, elected a Neapolitan, Urban VI. The cardinals revered him during two months, proclaimed their choice to the whole of Christendom; but when Urban adopted some measures to shake off their arbitrary influence, great numbers of them withdrew to Avignon, declared the elevation of Urban illegal, having been extorted by force, and elected a new Pope—Robert of Geneva, who took the name of Clement VII. (1378.) Now what was to be decided? on which side stood right and justice? France, Scotland, Naples, declared themselves in favour of Clement VII.; England and Germany sided with Urban. From that day the church had two Popes, each surrounded by a body of cardinals; each insisting, with extraordinary impudence and obstinacy, upon the full enjoyment of all the temporal and spiritual prerogatives; both putting no bounds to their rapacity. Each had a successor appointed at Avignon and at Rome. In vain France, England, Germany, used persuasion, threats, and force of arms; it was of no avail; neither Pope would yield; both resisted with an invincible stubbornness. The Christian sovereigns finally came to an understanding with the majority of the cardinals; and a general council was convoked at Pisa, in order to restore peace, order, and morality to the church. This council assembled in 1409. None of the projects were realised. The council, however, deposed the two Popes, and elected another

—Alexander V.—who promised that the church reform should be entrusted to another council three years later. Alexander V. was generally acknowledged. Arragon, however, still supported Benedict XIII., the Avignon Pope, whilst a part of Italy and of Germany protected the Roman Pontiff, Gregory XII. Instead of two Popes, therefore, now, there were three.

The council promised by Alexander V. was universally called for ; but this Pope had been succeeded by John XXIII., an ignoble specimen of human nature,—proud, despotic, sullied by crimes and debauchery ; he endeavoured to oppose the promised council ; but the general irritation was becoming clamorous ; murmurs of insurrection had been heard in numerous quarters ; finally, at the request of the Emperor Sigismund, the Pope convoked the council of Constance (1414). A most solemn meeting it truly was ; all the dignitaries of the church—ambassadors from all the courts—the most illustrious characters of Europe—crowded in the little city. The emperor in person opened the council. The assembly once organised, they proceeded to extirpate the *great schism of the West*. Not only the pontiffs deposed by the council of Pisa were condemned, but John XXIII. himself was deposed, and yielded after a vain resistance ; Gregory XII. submitted also ; as for Benedict XIII., he still resisted, but died, abandoned by all, in solitude. The council afterwards promulgated the great principle of the superiority of the council over the pontifical control. Now, at last, came the turn of church reforms ; but a party was already formed, which protested against any change ; it demanded, in the first place, the election of a new Pope. Martin V. was elected, consecrated, and, by the very fact, the reform was postponed. A committee, however, was appointed for the partial redress of the grievances ; they drew out eighteen propositions for the reform of the most revolting abuses, but the Pope refused to acquiesce in them : he entered into private agreements with the sovereigns, and concluded concordats, favourable to himself, with Germany and England. The council broke up without anything more being

said about the church reforms ; and the Christian world was once more disgracefully deceived.

But the clergy thus assembled at Constance did not separate without pronouncing an implacable judgment in reference to the new doctrines, as well as to all popular claims. When the whole Christian world was deploring the degradation of the church, it was impossible that men, bold, ardent, with a lofty soul, should not come forward as the representatives of the feelings of all, as the expression of the popular sentiments. The first was John Wickliffe, of Oxford, who, in 1370, began to preach against the Papal supremacy and the general corruption, proclaiming a doctrine that rejected many of the Roman dogmas, and shook the ecclesiastical authority. Wickliffe did not suffer much, considering the boldness of his tenets ; he was protected by the great, and died in peace. But not so with John Huss, who, at the commencement of the fifteenth century, professed the same doctrine at Prague : highly gifted—full of zeal, conscience and virtue—he soon became popular and beloved throughout Bohemia. Huss was condemned by the Pope ;—he appealed to a council-general, and appeared at Constance with a safe conduct from the emperor. His doctrines were examined, condemned ; and the reformer, given up to the executioner, was publicly burnt. Soon after, his disciple, Jerome of Prague, suffered the same cruel fate ; but Bohemia replied to the abominations of the council of Constance with fire and blood. Thus perished the two noble reformers : but doctrines and ideas are immortal—they baffle all human destruction ; and from their ashes emerged the spirit that has never ceased fermenting and dividing the whole of Christendom.*

Another attempt was made in vain to reform the church, by the church. A new council, convoked at Basle (1431), to put an end to the convulsive state of Bohemia, was opposed by the Pope, Eugenius IV., who would not consent to the reforms proposed. The council, however, aided by all the

* See Appendix, No. VI. (a.)

sovereigns of Europe, firmly resisted, and obliged the Pope to yield after a three years' negotiation; but all efforts were vain. Great confusion ensued, for the higher powers and Papacy were assailed with fury; extreme measures were proposed, but when the question came to attack also the episcopal abuses, the council hesitated. The truth is, that neither the popes, bishops nor kings wanted any reform at all; the mass of the people alone were in earnest. Another rupture followed between the council and the Pontiff, who ordered the council to be transferred to Ferrara, afterwards to Florence: he was not obeyed. An implacable and systematic opposition followed, engendering a general degree of acrimonious hostility; and in the end, the council, abandoned by all, and exposed to the armies that were then ravaging Europe, dispersed itself, and the abuses became more deeply rooted than ever.

During this period the Pontiffs were more especially Italian sovereigns. They entered into all political intrigues—sold their religious concessions to the highest bidders. The court of Rome had no other object in view but to obtain Italian principalities for the members of the Papal family; that court now reached the highest degree of political corruption, but this political existence ceased when Protestantism had obtained a formidable footing in Europe, whilst its moral state gradually improved.

Another reformer, before the great Reformation, appeared at the close of this period (1488), as unfortunate, although not so bold, as John Huss: Savonarola, a poor Dominican monk, conceived means and remedies against the pestiferous evils of his age. His idea was, that pointing out corruption and despotism was not sufficient, but, with the aid of a more gorgeous worship and incessant propagation of purer doctrines, through the education of the young, and the extirpation of all foreign and Pagan ideas, to prepare a new and better generation. During seven years, the city of Florence listened to his eloquence with enthusiasm; all objects of luxury were publicly destroyed; all the intellectual men of the time followed his impulse. Through his influence, the Florentines

had expelled the Medicis, and established a popular government. Charles VIII. and the French countenanced this revolution, but they were no sooner gone than Peter de Medicis, assisted by that class that is ever hostile to moral reform and moral restraint, endeavoured to resume their authority. All his partisans were sacrificed to the popular indignation : Savonarola, whose credit diminished for not having saved them, began to preach against the vices of Rome. The monster Pope, Alexander VI., excommunicated him, and Savonarola, insulted and persecuted, proposed to prove by the ordeal of fire the sacredness of his convictions : his disciples were also ready to brave the flames. An accident caused the ordeal to fail, and a crowd, excited against the poor reformer, rushed to his convent ; Savonarola was dragged away, put to the rack, condemned, and publicly burnt (1498). Later, when the passions were appeased, the iniquitous judgment was annulled, and the noble victim revered at Florence as a saint.*

FRANCE continued tending, as we have observed, towards unity and the concentration of power in the hands of royalty, whilst the body of citizens were acquiring greater importance, and feudal aristocracy declining. The two most energetic representatives of the constitutional movement in France were Philip the Fair and Louis XI., but the space between these two sovereigns is filled by the most ruinous and afflicting disasters that can overpower a nation. We must glance over them rapidly.

In 1270, Philip III. succeeded St. Louis ; nothing very important signalises his reign of fifteen years. A few facts only must be mentioned. Several useless wars against the kings of Arragon, who were disputing Naples with the Anjous ;—the annexation of Champagne and Brie ;—the first union of Navarre to France, by the marriage of Philip's son to the heiress of that country ;—and the foundation of the house of Bourbon by the marriage of Robert, the king's brother, with the heiress of the Bourbonnais. The accession of Philip the

* See Appendix, No. VI. (b.)

Fair (1285) commences an eventful reign. A quarrel between two sailors brought a renewal of the war with England; it soon terminated, through the intervention of Boniface, and the peace was sealed by the fatal marriage of Isabella of France with Edward prince of Wales. But Flanders, ally of the English, was to pay the expenses of the war; her count was kept prisoner, and that rich province confiscated. Philip had already proceeded similarly with La Marche and Angoumois, and Burgundy had been annexed to the family possessions by the marriage of his second son with the heiress Joanna. However, the Flemish would not become French; the royal financial extortions became intolerable; all the cities revolted. The French chivalry advanced with confidence and contempt to bring them to reason, but was annihilated by the Flemish at the battle of Courtray (1302); the victors brought back 4,000 golden spurs to adorn their churches. Two years after, the French avenged their defeat by the victory of Mons en Pucelle: but Flanders was lost; Philip returned it to the legitimate sovereign, keeping as a pledge that portion known by the appellation of French Flanders.

The rapacity of Philip the Fair was insatiable;—thefts, spoliations, forgery, murder—all means were justifiable, in his eyes, to gratify his endless cupidity. The thirst for luxuries was becoming inordinate; he left it as a legacy to his successors. We have seen his quarrel with Pope Boniface, and the mortal humiliation of that Pontiff. Another great *coup d'état* of Philip, variously appreciated, was the destruction of the illustrious order of the Knights Templars; it filled at once the royal treasury, and proved a severe blow to the aristocracy. The Templars were forming an independent state in the kingdom; their wealth and pride were excessive, and since the wars in the East had ceased, they had become formidable to the Christians alone. The Pope Clement consented, and the order was abolished—their property confiscated. But the hideous portion of the episode is the torture inflicted on the most illustrious members, and on the grand master, before their being sent to expire in the flames. Philip, not satisfied

with all his spoliations and fiscal forgeries, established a regular system of taxation which had never existed before; he also persecuted the Jews, those eternal victims of the mediæval period. There is nothing more harrowing in history than the incredible series and refinement of stigmas and cruelties inflicted on that unfortunate race by all the followers of Christ, until the nineteenth century.

The odious figure of Philip the Fair is associated with two of the great institutions of old France—the States-General and the Parliaments. We have spoken of the annual national assemblies, and stated that St. Louis, by inviting to them the mayor of the cities, had prepared the admission of the middle orders, the *Tiers Etat*. For the first time, in 1302, Philip convoked the states-general, and to it each order separately—the clergy, the nobility, and the *tiers état*, which was becoming a counterpoise. During the course of his reign, they were assembled again, each order discussing with royalty the taxes proposed. As to the states-general, they seemed to have been instituted in opposition to the parliaments, which became at this time a regular institution. These parliaments originated with feudal plaids of the higher feudality; they were supreme tribunals of the provinces, submitted to the royal authority. As the dominions and jurisdiction of the crown extended, these assemblies became fixed, and afterwards, instead of being composed of nobles and churchmen, they became formed of a limited number of persons accustomed to the practice of business. Such was the parliament organised in Paris in 1302, and, at the same time, at Toulouse and Rouen. For affairs of the highest importance the nobles were still called to sit in them; and when the king in person presided, they took the name of *lit de justice*.

The parliaments became supreme tribunals, and soon a new class of men—men of the law—filled them exclusively, instead of the nobles and clergy. Under Philip commenced the reign of the lawyers, argumentative servants of the king, and docile instruments of his iniquities. They totally ruined the feudal justice, by establishing that all justice emanates from the

crown; they also totally excluded the clergy from all jurisdiction that was not ecclesiastical. Philip, before his death (314), had annexed Lyons to the crown, by the cessation of the archbishop; he left three sons, who successively ascended the throne in the space of fourteen years. The eldest, Louis X., gave the order for the enfranchisement of the serfs—a great step, although pecuniary reasons induced him to it. He left a posthumous daughter; and it was on this occasion that Philip V., his brother, and the states-general, revived the old Salic law of the Franks, which merely applied to landed property, and from that day the female exclusion from the throne became part of the French constitution. The three sons of Philip the Fair leaving no male successor, his nephew, Philip VI., duke of Valois, became king of France (1328). Edward III. of England claimed the crown, on the right of his mother Isabella; his pretensions being rejected, both countries prepared for war.

But the war did not break out at once. The first years of the reign of Philip were a glorious time for the court of France; he had three kings in his suite—those of Navarre, Bohemia, and Majorque. Flanders having expelled their French count, the French chivalry exterminated them again at Cassel. The poor Flemish, fighting on foot, were overpowered by the heavy armoury they had put on in imitation of the nobility. Philip de Valois had formed extensive, ambitious plans. His fiscal administration was most oppressive. The city of Ghent gave the first signal of resistance. A brewer, Arteveld, put himself at the head of all the trades, and organised a popular government; he leagued himself with the natural ally of Flanders—England, and decided Edward III. to vindicate his rights as king of France. The war commenced slowly, although the French fleet was destroyed at L'Ecluse; Philip, aware of his own resources, was exhausting his enemy by dilatory campaigns. This lasted for years—ignoble war, dishonourable to France, ruinous to the people! A war of succession in Brittany had completed the difficulties; this hardy land became a seat of chivalrous feats and adventures.

The two candidates, John of Montfort and Charles de Blois, being taken prisoners, their wives continued the contest. These ladies commanded armies, defended cities with heroism—a most romantic episode! in which, however, the French lost both ground and influence.

Finally, the imprudent, giddy French chivalry was exterminated at the battle of Crecy (1346). The English only gained Calais by this signal victory, and after an obstinate resistance a truce was concluded, and Philip died (1350). He had added to France, Roussillon, the lordship of Montpellier, and the Dauphiné, John, his son and successor, gave way to his violent and irascible nature in his conduct with regard to the king of Navarre, who was claiming several French provinces. John had him seized treacherously, and caused his partisans to be put to death. He squandered away the finances; the states-general uttered bitter complaints; new taxes were levied on salt and merchandises, replaced afterwards by a personal tax. A new English invasion quieted all internal dissensions; Edward the Black Prince emerged from Guyenne with an army. John assembled all his chivalry, and again the French experienced a disastrous defeat at Poitiers; their king was made prisoner, and taken to London (1356). The calamities of civil war completed the miserable state of the country. The murmurs of revolutionary movements had long been heard in Europe, especially in France and Flanders. The yoke of the nobility had become more intolerable than ever; royalty was becoming most oppressive and iniquitous. After the battle of Poitiers, the indignation became universal. The states-general assembled again, and adopted revolutionary measures. The clergy united with the municipalites. Marcel, *Prévôt* of the merchants, was at the head of the movement. At last, useful reforms were supposed to be on the point of taking place—vain hopes! The French revolution of 1356, like all the democratical movements of the fourteenth century, was abortive. The evil was too great, and the remedies insufficient. Moreover, Marcel, in his ideas of reform, had only the municipalities in view; he wished to limit the royal

authority, and seemed indifferent to the calamities of the invasion and to the sufferings of the people. There were no symptoms of a national revolution. The states were assembled in 1356 by the *Dauphin* Charles, regent during his father's captivity; they assumed the whole administration, and prescribed liberal measures, such as the arming of the citizens, the restoring the municipal liberties, the formation of a council from the three orders of the state, to control the acts of the government, &c. The dauphin eluded giving his sanction to these decrees; he yielded apparently to the threats of the citizens, then escaped, and assembled a military force; he met with great sympathy in the provinces, and returned to besiege the capital. Marcel, whose power had augmented considerably, revolted the bourgeoisie by his pride and measures; he had invited the king of Navarre to Paris (Charles le Mauvais), to whom, it was reported, he wished to give the crown of France; and at the moment he was on the point of giving him up the city, he was murdered by his own soldiers, who were excited by the partisans of the dauphin (1358). Arteveld had perished in the same manner at Ghent (1345). The dauphin entered Paris, and the re-actions commenced.

If the citizens of the municipalities were represented in the states-general, it was not so with the rural population—the peasants; they were left to work, groan, and starve, without mercy, and they, in their turn, raised the standard of revolt during the Parisian insurrection. But those two facts were perfectly independent of each other, and totally unconnected. Nobles and citizens were all equally indifferent to the wretchedness of the peasant, who was called *Jacques bon-homme* (poor, good-natured fool). *Jacques*, the poor beast of burden, maddened at last by oppression and want, broke out with fury, and burnt and plundered all the castles of the tyrants. The rage of the peasants knew no bounds. The *Jacquerie* was a furious yell of despair, heard later in England, and still later in Germany, when the peasants were glutted with vengeance and rapine. The retaliation came. The nobles easily subdued that maddened populace without arms or discipline, and their

excesses of vengeance far surpassed those of the peasants, for they were cold-blooded and exceedingly refined in their inventions of tortures. Finally, order was restored over a sea of blood and ashes, and the groans died away. This is merely one of the many similar episodes of the *good olden times*.

This gloomy period of the history of France was crowned by the disastrous peace of Bretigny (1360), which restored John to liberty; an enormous ransom, and eleven provinces or cities, were given to the king of England. Edward, no doubt, had thought that he held then the kingdom of France in his power, but, finding the national feeling so invincibly anti-English, he endeavoured to mutilate, to ruin the country. In 1364, John the *Good* died, and his son, Charles the *Wise*, succeeded him; for it has been a general custom to give a surname to kings which has often been the contrary of what they deserved, and which often seems a denial of the popular feeling. Thus, Charles had more craftiness than wisdom. However, during his reign of sixteen years, France recovered from her prostration; he diminished the taxes, restored order in the administration, and prohibited the foundation of great feudal appanages for the princes of the royal family. He skilfully interfered in the Spanish affairs, and thus cleared the country of numerous bands of adventurers, which, under the command of Duguesclin, carried their depredatory habits beyond the Pyrenees.

Charles V. had been incessantly watching the English; he allowed them to weaken themselves in fruitless expeditions, to burn and ravage, then return exhausted; and when he saw Edward III. grown old, feeble, and inactive, the Black Prince dying at Bordeaux, he sent his cook to challenge the king of England. The war re-commenced. Duguesclin recovered gradually all the French provinces; the English at last only possessed Bordeaux, Bayonne, and Calais. This very system of Charles V. was cruel again for the rural population; they alone suffered plunder and rapine from the foreign foe, the cities being carefully protected by their strong walls and gates. Three great revolts were conspicuous during his reign—those

of Languedoc, Flanders, and Brittany, which he had confiscated, and where he had established the hated *gabelle*. Du-guesclin, himself a Breton, oppressed his countrymen, so powerful was the general feeling that the strength of France relied on her unity.

With Charles V. commences, as it were, a diplomatic system; he governed, and he, feeble and sickly, conducted a long war from his closet, whilst he introduced the duplicity of long negotiations and of a patient dissimulation. However, his restoration of France was more apparent than real. A few years of the calamitous reign of Charles VI. were to annihilate all he had done. Charles VI. was not twelve years old when he succeeded his father (1380). His uncles fell upon France like vampyres, to suck her blood to the last drop; they were the dukes of Anjou, of Berry, and Burgundy; the latter house had been extinct, but the duchy was re-established by King John in favour of his youngest son, who would not leave his side on the disastrous day of Poitiers. Again, the oppression, the heartless extortions, became intolerable, and a revolutionary movement broke out again. In Paris, the people armed with leaden mallets (*maillets*, whence they were called *maillotins*), struck down all the tax-gatherers. The maillotins were feared; the crown made great promises to them, which were afterwards eluded, as usual. The popular movement had extended to Flanders; the French nobility ran to the assistance of the count of Ghent, who had been expelled by the people, headed by Philip Arteveld, who was still more popular than his father had been. The terrible battle of Rosebecq (1382) beheld again the triumph of the nobility and of brutal force. The Flemish, keeping too close together, and being tied together to remain more compact, were literally stifled and crushed, all their bones cracking under the heavy cavalry. The victory of Rosebecq was the knell of all democratical movement. The victorious army returned to Paris in triumph—dashed away all promises, all obstacles—deprived the city of its franchises—declared the properties of the citizens confiscated;—in one word, established an unlimited tyranny.

The young king, however, shook off the ascendancy of his uncles. He was weak, nervous, excitable; the debauchery then reigning achieved the ruin of his constitution; a sudden terror produced insanity in his shattered frame, and the reins of government fell again into the hands of his uncles. But two of them were contending for the privilege of governing France, and their struggles filled the country with sanguinary troubles (1392). They were—the duke of Orleans, younger brother to the king, frivolous and corrupt, but accomplished and chivalrous; and the new duke of Burgundy, John the Fearless, heir to the rich duchy of Burgundy, and part of Flanders and Artois, through his mother. The civil war commenced without much intensity; but John, to close the contest at once, had the duke of Orleans assassinated one night, as the latter was returning, singing cheerfully, from supping with the queen (1407). John of Burgundy proudly confessed the crime, had it legally justified, and regained the favour of the public opinion by a great victory over the Liege people—the most bloody battle of all those fought during the fifteenth century, 25,000 dead being left on the field. A reconciliation with the Orleans party was effected, but it could not be of a long duration; the hatred was too inveterate, and civil war inevitable. It spread desolation in the whole kingdom during twelve years. The count of Armagnac, a southern noble, headed the Orleans party, which took his name. Armagnacs and Burgundians captured, lost, and re-captured Paris alternately; the insane king was their tool; the profligate queen, Isabeau, was on the Burgundian side. The citizens opposed the court. Scenes of carnage succeeded each other; the *maillotins* re-appeared and plundered; lastly, the foreign invasion was renewed, and proved more disastrous than ever for France.

Henry V. of England found the opportunity highly favourable. War with France was then the most popular cry in England. The Anglo-Saxon race had no other land where to expand their exuberant spirit of activity; they had only the channel to cross. The French nobility, moreover, had lately

been decimated by the Turks at Nicopolis. Henry landed in Normandy, and again the ignorance, vanity, and want of discipline of the French nobility, caused their destruction. The battle of Agincourt renewed the disasters of Crecy and Poitiers. Henry was master of France (1415).

In the meantime, Armagnacs and Burgundians continued their warfare; it was a sort of renewal of the hostilities between the South and the North, of the time of the Albigenes. The Burgundians at last remained masters of Paris, but the Orleans faction had taken away in their flight the poor old king and the heir to the crown. The English advanced upon Paris; in vain a reconciliation was attempted; the duke of Burgundy was, perhaps, on the point of coming to an arrangement with the dauphin, when he was assassinated by the Orleans faction on the bridge of Montereau (1419). Now the new duke of Burgundy, Philip the Good, and the queen, both holding Paris, and the king, joined the English;* and the treaty of Troyes was signed, by which Henry V. married Catherine of France, and was declared legitimate successor of Charles VI. The English entered Paris in triumph, and the nation, exhausted, submitted in silence (1420).

Four years after, Henry V. of England and Charles VI. of France died; and Henry VI., the young son of the English king, was proclaimed in France and England, under the guardianship of his uncle, the duke of Bedford. This event raised for a short time the party of the dauphin, who, at Bourges, with a handful of followers, was now Charles VII. Brittany entered into an alliance with him; he received assistance from Scotland. In spite of all, the English arms kept their superiority: again the French were exterminated at the battles of Crevant and Verneuil. Charles VII. was reduced to his last resources; the English came in 1428 to besiege Orleans, the fall of which would make them easily masters of the rest of France.

This is the most wretched epoch in the history of France.

* See Appendix, No. VI. (c.)

Desolation, ferocity and famine could go no further; the wolves were in possession of the country, and victims, even women, thrown to them. Excepting in the fortified cities, not a house was standing. The population was bowed down by exhaustion and a general discouragement. The gloom, tears, and groans, were universal. No gleam of hope for a better day. Religion and mysticism became the only refuge and consolation. The great Gerson felt that a regeneration, a revival, could only be engendered by a new principle of spiritual life; and such is the character and tendency of his *De Imitatione Christi*, an everlasting monument of religious consolation.* The people of France plunged into a mystical anguish, which found its expression in the fair apparition of a simple, enthusiastic country girl, who, inspired by an excessive, febrile, religious faith and love of her country, emerged from the people to save her king and country—and indeed both could only be saved by the people. The pure and ethereal figure of Joan of Arc has been sullied and disfigured by heartless ignorance; and thus a beautiful page in the history of humanity blotted by the coarse material investigator. The history of the Maid of Orleans is well known. She revived the failing courage of the French soldiers, and caused dismay and terror in the English ranks. She obliged the English to raise the siege of Orleans; then, city after city fell before the French; all obstacles were braved, and she escorted the king to Rheims, and beheld him crowned in the venerable cathedral, according to her prediction, thus restoring to him the prestige of his ancestral royalty. The consequences of her triumphant apparition and calm enthusiasm could easily be foreseen; the French arms took the ascendancy. When the maid was taken at the siege of Compiègne, in vain the enemies of France endeavoured to disgrace her by a trial, during which we know not which strikes us the most,—the native intelligence and energetic simplicity of the accused, or the infamous iniquity of the accusers. They burnt her, thinking they would thus destroy

* See Appendix, No. VI. (d.)

the spell (1431); whilst her blood produced, on the contrary, abundant fruits. The popular hatred assumed an intense energy. From that day the French arms were victorious; four years after her death, the duke of Burgundy abandoned the English, Paris opened its gates, and the king of France was restored. The war continued many years longer in the provinces; a truce which lasted five years was signed in 1444; and when hostilities were again renewed, France gradually recovered all her provinces. Bordeaux was the last city that held for the English; it fell on the same year that beheld the death of old Talbot, the hero of those wars, and with him ended a struggle of a hundred years (1453).

Now France returned to the national object. Charles restored order in the church and the administration, established the principle of a standing army, attended to the regulation of legal customs of proceedings. The finances were placed on a regular footing by the famous Jacques Cœur, who experienced afterwards the truly royal ingratitude of his master. Under Charles VII. the opposition and rivalry between the crown and the nobility began anew. There were only two formidable duchies—Brittany and Burgundy. But the less powerful lords united and formed a league; they recognised no law, human or divine; they proudly scorned all control. The people turned in despair to the king, their only hope; and feudalism, which had been beneficial in the tenth century, was now a scourge. Charles repressed this league with great difficulty; it is known by the name of *Praguerie*, a war similar to that of the Hussites of Prague, and it long remained formidable and threatening. Louis XI. and Richelieu were its mortal foes, and had its more lofty heads lopped off.

Louis XI., crafty and ambitious, is the most energetic representative of the national unity, that rejects all privileges and traces of federalism. Unable to reach his object openly, and internally soured by many treasons, he undertook a course of subterranean policy with an indefatigable perseverance; and when he felt power on his side, he was merciless with his foes, as they had been with him. He identified himself with

the unity and grandeur of his country, and was deaf to all other consideration. On his accession to the throne (1461) he found a formidable league against him—the league of the public weal, the name of which was an homage to the progress of enlightenment. The fidelity of Paris saved him; but he soon, with infinite skill, patience, and craftiness, divided his foes, and saw them attack and destroy each other. Charles the Bold, of Burgundy, had been his most formidable antagonist; he had the satisfaction to behold this powerful prince run headlong with pompous display against the rough peasants and the rocks of Helvetia, and there to see him cut down with his gorgeous army at Granson and Morat, and afterwards to find a grave under the walls of Nancy (1477). Proud Burgundy existed no longer after him; although the heiress, Mary, had married Maximilian of Austria, Louis XI. laid his grasp on Burgundy, Picardy, and Artois, and kept them by virtue of the peace of Arras, in spite of a war and of the doubtful battle of Guinegates.

Louis XI. pursued his object, nevertheless, during the warfare; all the formidable chiefs of the aristocracy fell successively; he had purchased Roussillon; he obtained Anjou, Maine, and Provence, after the death of the good troubadour king, René. His organising genius evinced itself in the new parliaments which he created, in the finances, in the admirable state of the army, in the regulations of the trades, the establishments of the municipal governments, and of the police. In short, on his death he left France powerful and flourishing, and then the most powerful kingdom in Europe (1483).

With his successor, Charles VIII., commences a new period. His sister, the regent, the dame de Beaujeu, continued the political system of Louis XI. A re-action of the aristocracy against it became formidable. But the regent assembled the states-general, at Tours—appealed to the democratic tendencies of that assembly in favour of the crown, and the insurrection of the nobility, headed by the duke of Orleans, was defeated. The marriage of the young king with the heiress of Brittany, the last of the great feudal principalities,

crowned that profound policy. In spite of all obstacles, the progress of France had been rapid. The constitution was formed—the states-general, the parliaments, the standing army—regular taxes were established. Feudalism was no more; the national unity had acquired great solidity, and the country was well prepared to enter into the mighty events of the sixteenth century, and of modern history. With Charles VIII. a new, ardent generation succeeded to the old friends and adherents of his fathers. The young king and his court were longing for martial adventures. As the heir of the Anjous, he claimed Naples, made the most culpable sacrifices to facilitate the realisation of his ambitious plans, and embarked on an adventurous expedition, null in its results, however chivalrous in its execution, and returned to his capital, where an accidental and premature death awaited him (1498).

ENGLAND, as well as France, exhibited the struggle between the aristocracy and the crown, with the violent explosion of popular feelings; but here the nobility of the land was not subdued by royalty. In England, when the nobles could no longer make of France a prey to fall upon, they devoured each other in a civil war that mowed down the *élite* of their body. The aristocracy afterwards constituted itself on a solid basis, by securing for itself every privilege; and it formed at the end of this period, that rich, proud, oppressive body—not powerful enough to divide England into scattered principalities, but sufficiently so to exercise an incessant control over the crown, and over the people. Edward I. (1272) was firm, impetuous, and grasping. The lords, clergy and commons checked, several times, his fiscal encroachments; he succeeded, however, in resisting all dangerous opposition, and in increasing the royal domains, by the confiscation of all the fiefs, the possession of which was not justified by titles.

Edward I. has been styled the *English Justinian*, and it seems that more was done in the first thirteen years of his reign to settle and establish the distributive justice of the kingdom, than in all the ages since that time put together.

We will merely mention his chief regulations. He confirmed and settled the great charter and charter of forests ; he limited the bounds of ecclesiastical jurisdiction ; he defined the limits of the several temporal courts of the highest jurisdiction ; he settled the boundaries of the inferior courts in counties, hundreds, and manors, and abolished all arbitrary taxes and talliages, levied without consent of the national council ; he gave up the royal prerogative of sending mandates to interfere in private causes ; he first established a repository for the public records of the kingdom ; he improved upon the laws of King Alfred for preserving the public peace, and reformed the abuses incident to tenures ; he instituted a speedier way for the recovery of debts, and provided for the recovery of advowsons, as temporal rights ; his reiterated statutes of mortmain were adapted to meet the frauds that had been devised ; he established a new limitation of property, by the creation of estates tail, &c., &c. In short, with reference to the constitutions of Edward I., such was their excellence, that, from his time to that of Henry VIII., there happened very few, and those not very considerable, alterations in the legal forms of proceedings.

The military expeditions of Edward consisted of his conquest of Wales, and his war with Scotland.

The primitive history of Scotland is obscure, and long remains without any characteristic feature, with regard to civilisation,—although the native history of the *clans* and lairds, of legends and chivalrous deeds, is highly picturesque. After the Norman Conquest, the king, Malcolm, resisted William the Conqueror, and ventured on an expedition into England: it is alleged that, after concluding a truce, he was compelled by William to do homage for his kingdom. The truth is, that this homage was only for the territories of Cumberland and Northumberland, won by the Scots, and this homage was afterwards absurdly made the pretext of a claim of feudal sovereignty over all Scotland. To Malcolm, and his queen, Margaret, the kingdom owed a degree of civilisation remarkable in those ages of barbarism.

After him we have a series of eight kings, down to Alexander III., among whom we find David I., the collector of all the ancient laws of his country (1124), celebrated by Buchanan, as an honour to his country and to monarchy. On the death of Alexander III., without male issue, Bruce and Baliol were competitors for the crown, and Edward, taken as umpire, arrogated to himself the feudal sovereignty of the kingdom. He adjudged the crown to Baliol; and when the latter renounced his allegiance, Edward invaded Scotland with an immense force. A furious, cruel war ensued. It was the time of the immortal achievements of Wallace and Robert Bruce. The Scotch suffered greatly, but remained indomitable in their resistance.

After the death of Edward I. (1307), Scotland was lost for England. His weak successor, Edward II., was defeated by Bruce, at Bannockburn; after which he abandoned himself to worthless favourites, and became odious to the nobility. An expedition undertaken to Ireland to put a stop to civil war, and to the arrogant independence of the English chivalry, brought no results whatever. Edward was constantly exposed to conspiracies. At last, the Queen Isabella and her son placed themselves at the head of the discontented: the king was taken and cruelly put to death in prison. Edward III. ascended the throne, under the regency of his mother, which he soon shook off (1327).

The name of Edward is, above all, celebrated for his wars with France: they have already been alluded to. These wars diverted the pretensions of the barons, and the king sternly punished also several of his ministers. The constitution received many important modifications. Under Edward III. the parliament is supposed to have assumed its present form; by a separation of the Commons from the Lords. The statute for defining and ascertaining treasons was one of the first productions of this new-modelled assembly: and the translation of the law proceedings from French into Latin, another. Much was done also for establishing the domestic manufactures: the exportation of English wool was prohibited,

as well as the importation or wear of foreign cloths and furs. The legislature encouraged commerce with skill and zeal: it enlarged the credit of the merchant, by introducing the statute staple; also provided for the distribution of personal property, among creditors and kindred, in case of intestacies. The civil power of the Pope was depressed, whilst a laborious parochial clergy was established. It was also settled that the peers could be judged by the parliaments only; and the cases of high treason were carefully determined. Finally, the English language was generally substituted for the Norman-French, as official language. Besides France, Edward vanquished Scotland; he gave his aid to the Baliol party, which disputed the throne with David, the young son of Robert Bruce. The brilliant success of the English arms was of no avail; honour, alone, was derived from the English victories during this period. The close of the splendid career of Edward was clouded over and embittered by his discussions with the parliament, by the unfortunate Spanish wars, and, above all, by the death of his illustrious son, the Black Prince; the king did not long survive him; and his grandson, Richard II., succeeded him at the age of eleven (1377).

The contest for power between the king's uncles, Lancaster, York, and Gloucester, embroiled all public measures. The barons were generally discontented; but a greater danger was menacing them as well as the king. Ideas of reformation were propagated, and the people were in a ferment. Suddenly new exactions called forth a revolt (1382). Evangelical doctrines in opposition to the luxuries and ostentation of the clergy and nobles were publicly preached and propagated. At last, masses of people approached London. The king appeared in the midst of them; they demanded the abolition of certain taxes and of serfdom; the king seemed to hesitate, when one of his suite struck down the chief of the revolt, Wat Tyler; the crowd then dispersed, and merciless executions forced the citizens and peasants to remain dumb. The rest of the reign of the weak and facile Richard was filled by internal disorders. Taking advantage of his absence, while engaged in quelling

an insurrection in Ireland, Henry of Lancaster rose in open rebellion. Richard, on his return, was compelled to resign the crown, and was soon after privately assassinated. Then began the contentions between the houses of York and Lancaster (1399).

Henry IV. reigned with energy; he successfully combated all the rebellions of the aristocracy. At the battle of Shrewsbury, the Scotch, Welsh and the Northumbrians united, were defeated, and their leader, Hotspur, killed. A second formidable rebellion was quelled with equal success: but there exists a dark blemish on this reign; the secular arm was rigorously extended against the followers of Wickliffe, and it saw the first detestable examples of religious persecution.

With Henry V. (1413) the military expeditions, so popular in England, were renewed. The battle of Agincourt, and the acquisition of the crown of France, are magnificent pages of the history of this reign, and of England. We have seen that this glory was not to be of a long duration. The war of the two roses brought back upon England all the disasters and sufferings that her invasions and victories had inflicted on France. After the death of Henry V. (1422), and of the Regent Bedford, England was embroiled again by the factious contention for power between the uncles of the young and feeble Henry VI. Richard, duke of York, whose faction was distinguished by the *white rose*, was a claimant of the crown: he descended, by his mother, from the second son of Edward III., and, in the male line, from his fourth son. The party of Lancaster, with the *red rose*, now occupying the throne, descended, in direct line, from the third son of that prince. The nation divided in arms between the rival parties. During thirty years it made England a field of slaughter, destruction, and carnage. More than eighty princes of the royal blood perished, either in battle or on the scaffold. The nobility was decimated—the country ruined. We will not enter into this fearful episode of the history of England: the vicissitudes of Henry VI., Margaret of Anjou, and Warwick, the king-maker—the implacable butcheries of the battles of St.

Alban's, Wakefield, Hexham, Barnet, and Tewkesbury—are too well known. Edward IV., of York, finally secured the throne by the death of all his competitors, and abandoned himself to his vicious and tyrannical nature: he was preparing to gratify his subjects by another war with France, when he died suddenly (1483). His brother, Richard, duke of Gloucester, named protector in the minority of his nephews, hired a populace to declare in his favour, and was proclaimed king, by the title of Richard III. He ordered his two nephews to be smothered while asleep. The genius of Shakespeare has inflicted an eternal blight on Richard III. But the celebrated play was written for the gratification of the Tudors, and was expressive of popular prejudices. The veils of the tragical muse, and of poetry in general, must always be removed, however respectfully, by the impartial hand of historical truth. Richard's faults and crimes belonged to his time chiefly, and cannot wash away his talents, his chivalrous bravery, his patriotism, and the traces of his short reign which he left in the institutions of his country. Let us suppose that, in 1815, a poet of genius in England had written a tragedy on Napoleon, expressive of the popular feeling—even at this epoch of enlightenment—would it not have been an everlasting tissue of fabulous horrors?

A surviving heir of the house of Lancaster still existed in Henry Tudor, earl of Richmond. He landed in England, revived the almost extinguished Lancastrian party, and vanquished Richard at the battle of Bosworth (1485). Richard III., maddened by the dastard ingratitude and treasons he experienced, fought with desperate courage, and died the death of a hero.

Henry VII. was crowned immediately; and, by his marriage with Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV., he united the two roses. England, during his reign of twenty-four years' duration, and under his wise and politic government, recovered from all the wounds it had suffered. Royal authority was restored; and it then assumed that temperate character which was developed later. Industry, good order, and per-

fect subordination, were certainly the fruits of his reign. His administration was characterised by a great degree of vigour, but also of excessive avarice. Henry and his ministers were more industrious in hunting out old and forgotten laws, in order to extort money from the subject, than in framing any new beneficial regulations. The great character of his reign was the amassing of treasures for the king; and every alteration of the law, salutary or otherwise, had no other immediate object. This system of extortion accounts, perhaps, for the considerable support found by two impostors, who endeavoured to usurp the crown, and were finally defeated. Henry, in 1509, left the throne to his son, Henry VIII.

GERMANY, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, exhibits the results of the long contentions between the Empire and Papacy. Whilst everywhere else in Europe, nationalities constituted themselves on the wrecks of feudalism, the division of Germany into independent principalities was finally fixed. Italy was withdrawing more and more from her former northern antagonist: and a humble submission to the Pontiff had replaced the obstinate resistance of former times. During a great part of this period, Germany presents a monotonous and sterile history—oscillating between two parties—the emperor and the league of electors; the first having no other object while holding the dignity conferred, but the aggrandisement of his own house; the latter, ever opposing the emperor, and at every new election placing another house on the throne, until the house of Austria obtained permanent possession of the imperial crown.

The reign of Rodolf, of Hapsburg (1273-1291), is justly celebrated in Germany. He has truly been called the second restorer of the empire; none of his predecessors, except Charlemagne, ever procured such benefits for it. He had been a humble territorial count, and proved himself a great emperor and an extraordinary man. No man had ever such difficulties to encounter; and none, perhaps, ever encountered them with so much success. He combined great caution with surpassing valour; great piety and wisdom with an unexam-

pled spirit of enterprise. He restored the state administration and internal tranquillity; sternly suppressed all private wars; and gave rare examples of virtue and probity. He twice subdued the rebellious Ottocar, of Bohemia—and Austria, as well as Styria, being annexed to his own domains, they were inherited by his two sons. From that day the duchy of Austria remained in the house of Hapsburg. Rodolf had also the good sense to reconcile the empire with the church, by renouncing all jurisdiction over Rome, which, in fact, was only the renunciation of a shadow. When this noble prince breathed his last, the jealousy, ambition and intrigues of the electors awoke again. Albert, the only surviving son of Rodolf, was excluded, and the feeble, corrupt Adolf, of Nassau, elected by dint of intrigue and corruption (1291-1298); he soon became generally unpopular. Albert availed himself of it; had his rival deposed, and himself elected. Albert I. (1298-1308) and Adolf met in arms, near Worms, where, at the battle of Gölheim, or Rosenthal, the latter fell mortally pierced by the hand of his rival. The victorious emperor, scarcely in possession of the throne, had to encounter another formidable league, which he successfully defeated. He was preparing to penetrate into Switzerland, where the mountaineers had formed themselves into a confederacy for the defence of their rights, when he was assassinated by his nephew, not far from the castle of Hapsburg—the cradle of his family.

Albert I. had never been popular; his son, Frederic of Austria, however worthy of the dignity, was excluded from the throne; and again intrigue and corruption gave the imperial crown to Henry VII., duke of Luxemburg (1308-1318). He took advantage of his elevation to secure the Bohemian crown in his family, he arbitrarily and iniquitously forced the heiress of this kingdom to marry his son John, and had him recognised king. Henry VII. had the folly to undertake an expedition into Italy, which, although partially successful, had no useful results whatever. His predecessors had wisely refrained from interfering in the affairs of Italy during half a

century, and there he died, near Sienna. His death re-plunged Germany into the horrors of a civil war. The Austrian princes espoused the interests of Frederic, their head; another party eagerly pronounced in favour of Lewis V. of Bavaria. Two emperors, therefore, were proclaimed—both high-minded and chivalrous; they appealed to arms, and met at Mülhdorf (Sept. 1322), where the brilliant rashness of Frederic, who, with his waving plumes and splendid armour, imprudently rushed to the attack, lost the day; scorning to flee, he was taken prisoner; but the magnanimous Lewis received him with the highest assurances of esteem. The war continued. Lewis incurred the implacable hostility of the Pope, who declared him deposed of his dignity. Although the rival emperors of Mülhdorf had become inseparable and devoted friends, the princes of Austria continued the war, supported by the Pope. Lewis undertook an unfortunate expedition into Italy, which augmented the Papal wrath; but the Papal thunders were generally powerless. In 1338, the diet of Frankfort issued a memorable declaration:—that the imperial authority depended on God alone, that the Pope had no temporal influence, that the sovereign chosen by the electors became legitimate emperor without need of Papal confirmation, that all persons who maintained the reverse should be guilty of high treason. Nevertheless, the diet still regarded Lewis as under the curse of God, and of the church; time had not yet sanctioned those independent principles; and Lewis unfortunately contradicted their spirit, by mean submissions and humiliating applications for absolution: they were unsuccessful; his fate seemed decided; a formidable league formed again for his ruin, headed by Charles of Bohemia; the civil war was renewed, and the emperor, depressed and harrassed, died in the midst of these troubled scenes.

Charles IV. of Bohemia (1347-1378) had been elected twelve months before the decease of Lewis. He is celebrated for the publication of the famous *Golden Bull*—so called from the golden seal appended to it—which fixed definitely the number and prerogatives of the electors, and has

ever since been a fundamental law of the empire. He paid special attention to the administration of Bohemia, where he founded the university of Prague. He neglected Germany, and twice descended into Italy to receive the imperial crown, and sell rights and privileges to the highest bidder—each time returning to Germany followed by the curses of Italy and the contempt of Europe. Wenceslas, his eldest son—a ferocious sensualist and a drunkard—succeeded to the Germanic throne, and the possession of Bohemia and Silesia;—Sigismund, the second, obtained Brandenburg;—John, the youngest, Schweidnitz, Goerlitz, and Lusatia. The extravagances and debaucheries of Wenceslas engendered hostile parties in every direction. The imperial authority became a dead letter. The cities of the Rhine, on one side, and those of Suabia on the other, formed themselves into confederacies for their own security, and to put a check to private wars; probably they assailed indiscriminately the nobles and their castles. Then, again, the princes and knights leagued themselves with alacrity against those cities. The feeble emperor was constantly oscillating between one party and the other; he favoured one or the other, according to the caprice of the moment. At length, to counterbalance the mischief of both, he himself formed a confederation, consisting alike of princes and cities, the object of which was to restore the public peace. But this league, on the contrary, committed acts of violence, and Wenceslas, to punish it, encouraged the cities to take up arms: the war became general. In the meantime, the imperial excesses of low debauchery could not be exceeded. In 1400, a diet deposed Wenceslas, and declared the throne of Germany vacant. The suffrages of the electors fell on Robert, Count Palatine, a prince devoid of influence and talents, and whose administration of ten years—whether in Italy or Germany—consisted in a series of impolitic measures and misfortunes. He vainly endeavoured to destroy the union of the cities; these associations were too formidable. Robert was a mere phantom of royalty; most of the territorial princes were even more powerful than this feeble emperor. His un-

expected death preserved Germany from another spectacle of successful rebellion (1410).

Sigismund, who by marriage had obtained the crown of Hungary, was now elected king of the Romans, and recognised unanimously, after a few obstacles. He was crowned emperor in 1433 by Pope Eugenius IV. The reign of Sigismund is, above all, celebrated for his intervention in the affairs of the church. The council of Constance was convoked through his zealous exertions to terminate the schism we have spoken of; from him John Huss procured a safe conduct, and repaired to the council, ardent in his hopes; undaunted, even when on the fatal spot of execution, tied to the stake, he refused to retract that which he considered as truth, and for which he died in the flames. Bohemia rose in arms, and then commenced a religious insurrection, which made all the princes of Germany tremble. The Hussites found in Ziska an able and terrible chief, and Sigismund sustained several defeats. Ziska, although blind, waged a war of extermination against the imperial army, its partisans, and the monasteries and priests. At last, the emperor, reduced to great extremities, was glad to sanction the negotiation of a truce, in which the chief demands of the reformers were conceded. After the death of Ziska, the depredatory band of Hussites that spread terror over all Germany were commanded by Procopius. Their dissensions brought on their ruin; they split into many parties—the *Taborites*, so called from the hill near Prague, on which they built a fortress, to which they gave the puritanical name of *Tabor*; and the *Calixtines*, from the constancy with which they insisted on the *cup*, and which constituted their most distinguishing characteristic. The Calixtines were the most moderate of all. Other sects also exhibited the most revolting madness and ferocious cruelty. The Hussites experienced afterwards great disasters. Prague was recovered by the imperialists. Procopius fell in a general action, with a multitude of his fanatics; still those remaining were numerous and formidable. Sigismund renewed his negotiations—made remarkable concessions, which, however, he

had not the slightest intention of observing—and he was received by the kingdom;—he made a magnificent entry into Prague. But, scarcely restored, he commenced persecutions against the Hussites—banished them. Another insurrection was fermenting, and was suspended by his death (1437).

After Sigismund, the house of Austria returned to the imperial throne, and has never left it since. The only daughter of Sigismund had been married to Albert of Austria, who then inherited Bohemia and Hungary. The diet of Frankfort elected him as king of the Romans; he accepted with considerable reluctance, but his fleeting reign of two years offers little to strike the attention. He reduced the Bohemian rebels, and proposed to the diet several good regulations for the internal peace of the empire; and as the Turkish domination was fearfully extending, Albert II. marched against the invaders, but had no opportunity of assailing them, and died of a dysentery in an obscure village, leaving no issue, but a pregnant wife. His death plunged Hungary and Bohemia into new troubles (1439).

After the death of Albert, the choice of the electors fell on his cousin, Frederic duke of Styria, whose long reign of fifty-three years is only remarkable by the extreme weakness of Germany during the whole of that period. Frederic III. was retired, indolent, avaricious, fond of study, adverse to war—little adapted, therefore, for the active duties required from the head of the Germanic state. However, he interfered in the affairs of the church;—a new schism was dividing Christendom. The emperor lent his support to the Holy See, and conciliated the dissenting bishops; and when he had restored tranquillity to the church, he had the gratification of going to receive the imperial crown at the hands of Pope Nicolas V. It was the last time that Rome saw in its walls the consecration of a successor to Otho the Great. The illustrious Ranke has drawn the character of Frederic III. more favourably than any preceding historian.

Hungary, falling to a minor son of Albert, was detached from the empire, and entered a period of glory illustrated by

the great Hunniades, and by Mathias Corvinus, afterwards elected king; both by their genius and heroism checked the invading torrent of the Ottomans. Bohemia also revolted, and the Hussites raised to the throne the celebrated Podiebrad, who maintained himself on it in spite of the empire and its chief. Frederic III. was compelled, in 1459, to acknowledge him as king of Bohemia, which, on the death of Podiebrad (1471), elected Wladislas, son of Casimir, king of Poland. Frederic's protracted and inglorious reign terminated in 1493. Even his hereditary dominions did not always remain in his hands; he succeeded, however, in his sole great object, viz., the aggrandisement of his own house: that object cost him a long and severe struggle. He negotiated a marriage between his son Maximilian, and Mary, daughter and heiress of Charles the Rash, duke of Burgundy;—he erected Austria into an archduchy, conferring on its sovereigns the privilege of creating nobles and of imposing taxes, without even the formality of applying to the diet;—indeed, his great governing principle was the maintenance and augmentation of his prerogatives. The accession of his son Maximilian I. encountered no opposition. With him the situation of Germany was totally changed, and then commenced the vast influence and ambition of the house of Austria. His reign is the most important era in the history of the public law of Germany. His son Philip became the husband of Juana, the heiress of Castille, and was father to the Emperor Charles V. Hence the rivalry between Spain and the empire on one side, and France on the other, which raged with fury down to the eighteenth century. Its history and results belong to the Fourth Period.

Since Rodolf of Hapsburg, the Germanic constitution had remained almost stationary. The *Golden Bull*, in fixing the number of electors and the formalities of the election, had only regulated ancient institutions. The number of princes of the empire augmented daily, in consequence of the divisions of the successions; however, the principle of primogeniture and of the indivisibility of a state was gradually admitted, and during the following period the multiplicity of sovereign

houses ceased. At this epoch was formed the hierarchy of the titles of nobility, and the faculty of granting new titles was conferred on the emperor. Another last effort for an organisation of the empire belongs to the commencement of the following period; it was the division of Germany into circles, and the formation of an imperial council. The object was to put an end to private divisions and wars. Germany was at first divided in four circles—afterwards in ten—each having its special diet, an hereditary president or director, an hereditary prince, a supreme judge, and a colonel, charged with the military department. The internal organisation of each of these circles was considerably improved by succeeding diets. The imperial council, or chamber, was highly disagreeable to the emperor; its object being to judge the dissensions between the various states, it thus encroached on the imperial jurisdiction. In 1501, Maximilian laid the foundation of the celebrated *Aulic Council*, in opposition to this hated tribunal, with attributes and a competency which soon extended. But none of those institutions tended to restore the unity of the empire, each individual sovereignty growing daily more exclusively and firmly established.

The diets were composed of three colleges—that of the noble electors, that of the princes, with whom voted the knights, and that of the imperial cities; these were then in their highest prosperity. All the cities of the North formed part of the *Hanseatic League*, at the head of which were Lübeck, Hamburg, and Bremen. This celebrated league was formed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; its original and primary object was commercial security. The number of the cities of the league was about seventy, distributed into four classes. The good effected by the Hanseatic league was most striking: it repressed piracy and plunder; it carried civilisation into every country surrounding the Baltic; it brought into contact the northern with the southern nations of Europe; it opened mines, multiplied domestic manufactures, encouraged agriculture, and, by an interchange of commodities, scattered the seeds of refinement. For their internal

government, they had recognised, admirably-defined statutes and laws. Unfortunately, the ambition and wealth of the league produced considerable evils; its arrogance and tyranny became intolerable and odious; the magnificence and luxuries of the cities, the corrupting style of living of the rich inhabitants, became also, as usual, a cause of decay. Like the cities of Italy, they had factions, dissensions, and internal broils; this, again, tended naturally to weaken them, and they gradually fell under the yoke of their enemies, viz.,—the czar of Russia, the emperor of Germany,—indeed, all the kings and princes; and the Colossus of the Hanseatic league fell. Only three of its cities have remained, and still call themselves the *Hanse Towns*—Lubeck, Hamburg, and Bremen. The cities of the South had also formed a league on various occasions, but never succeeded in being acknowledged as a constituted power.

During the fourteenth century, a new country—SWITZERLAND—emerged from the centre of the Alps, and entered into the movement of Europe. Helvetia, alternately inhabited by Gauls, Burgundians, Lombards, and Alemanni, had formed part of the kingdom of Arles, and there also feudalism had engendered a variety of political relations and governments. The ecclesiastical lordships of Basil, Geneva, Lausanne, of the abbey of St. Gall, the free imperial cities of Zurich, Berne, &c., a multitude of lay lordships, boroughs and villages, all possessing franchises and immunities—acknowledged the imperial supremacy. Such was the state of Switzerland during the Middle Ages. The confederation of the three Alpine cantons round the lake of Lucerne became the originator of modern Switzerland.

The counts of Hapsburg, suzerains of those countries, being emperors and dukes of Austria, did not respect the franchises and privileges of those primitive states. Their delegates became oppressive, and roused the indignation of those simple but stout-hearted people. The cantons of Schwitz, Uri, and Underwalden, formed a conspiracy; the leaders met secretly, at night, on the Rutli, a small piece of land at the foot of rocks in the lake of Lucerne, and only accessible by water.

The plot was laid out with prudence and moderation, the whole to explode on the 1st of January, 1308, and fires were to be lighted on the snowy mountains as the signal of success in the cantons ;—but one of the conspirators of Uri, Wilhem Tell (*der Toll*, the hot-headed), about three months before the great day appointed, refused proudly, in Altorf, to bow before the Austrian escutcheon. The governor enjoined this homage to all, in order to find out the disaffected. Tell was seized ; being a celebrated marksman, he was ordered, with cruel derision, to aim at an apple on the head of his son. He succeeded ; but continuing to threaten, and indomitable, he was dragged away, to be taken across the lake to prison. During a storm, he darted on land, escaped, awaited the tyrant near his castle, and pierced his heart with an arrow. The conspiracy was endangered by this private vengeance. Energetic, vindictive measures were expected on the part of the Austrians ;—the conspirators were fearful and displeased. However, nothing transpired ; communications, moreover, were then difficult ; and on the 1st of January, all the fires burning on the surrounding heights announced to the noble children of the Alps that they were free.

The three cantons formed a league ; that land became the land of Schwitz (*Schweitzerland*, Switzerland). They combined to assert their freedom. Seven years after, Leopold of Austria came with a brilliant army to subdue the rebellious peasants, and to punish them for their insolence. But the undaunted Swiss, although vastly inferior, assailed, crushed and slaughtered the Austrian chivalry, in the pass of Morgarten (1315). The rest of the cantons by degrees joined the association : Lucerne in 1332 ; Zurich, 1351 ; then Glaris, Zug, and Berne, 1353. Those eight cantons were long the only ones of the confederacy. Austria undertook another expedition against them ; again her army was defeated, and cut to pieces, through the heroism of Arnold of Winkelred. Soon after, another victory over the Austrians, at Nœfels, enabled them to dictate their own conditions.

The Swiss are illustrious for their valour, their love of

liberty, and their fidelity. They at times, it is true, were aggressive and unjust, in order to extend their domination, and oppressive with regard to the lands conquered from the feudal lords; but relatively, they were very superior in this respect to any other nation; they adhered to the customs of the age with comparative toleration. Unfortunately, their internal contentions were very detrimental to their progress. Zurich, during a long struggle with the other cantons, did not blush to ally itself with Austria. Between 1481 and 1513, the confederation acquired four new cantons, Friburg, Soleure, Basil, and Schaffhausen. The cantons then attained the number of thirteen, and remained thus till the French revolution.

The Swiss cantons were united by a treaty, which stipulated measures for their mutual union and succour. Their great bond was the annual diet, in which each canton had a voice. With respect to its internal government and economy, each canton was independent. Of some, the constitution was monarchical, and of others republican: in most of them existed an oppressive, ignorant and hard-hearted aristocracy. To the thirteen cantons were annexed or allied cities and states, such as the abbey of St. Gall, the bishopric of Sion, the cities of Geneva, Neufchatel, Mulhausen, &c.; and two other smaller leagues, that of the Grisons and of the Valais. The domains conquered use to form *baillages*, governed by the cantons. The nineteenth century has seen all Switzerland attain a complete unity in a general division into cantons, and real liberty become the possession of all. Its industrious population has zealously promoted agriculture and manufactures. Now, Switzerland is the only, and a perfect, model in Europe of the inestimable advantages of federalism.

We are obliged to protract this chapter beyond the usual limits. We must speak briefly of the state of Italy during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The next chapter will be especially devoted to Spain, Portugal, and the north of Europe, which we have neglected hitherto, in order afterwards to enter fully into the new period, the sixteenth century—and modern history.

Nothing can be more varied, picturesque, and attractive, than the spectacle offered by Italy during this period. The political events and movements had become in that fair country a source of infinite activity, of universal agitation, and of a vivid, enchanting development of the human faculties: but those very same events and movements slowly prepared her slavery and annihilation. The imperial control was no longer threatening Italy: the expeditions of a few emperors remained devoid of any result. In the meantime an internal transformation was gradually advancing and changing the general character of the Peninsula. The republican liberty of the cities of Italy was bound down by the domination of the lords and princes: this arose from the democratical reaction of the people, the people hitherto having been excluded from enjoying the rights and privileges of citizens. Like the tyrants of the ancient cities of Greece, the Italian nobles became the protectors of that population which had greatly augmented, and which bore with impatience the yoke of the wealthy and reigning classes. Under the title of *Capitano del popolo*, they gradually assumed the various powers, and, in the end, obtained an almost absolute authority, viz., the *Signoria generale*, or *perpetua*. On the other hand, that interminable struggle between Guelfs and Ghibellins, no longer excited by its original causes, but having become a mere name, serving all the private ambitions and hostilities, conduced to the subjection of the weaker lords by the more powerful; thus, the inferior principalities decreasing daily, prepared the formation of a small number of states of an equal power, and keeping a reciprocal political equilibrium.

Such was the result obtained generally in Italy, but obtained only after the most frightful, implacable contentions. A long war between each state, and the foreign wars, the internal convulsions, all tended to foment a fearful anarchy. Never has a nation injured itself so deeply. It is the spectacle of a long, deplorable suicide. At the same time, this prodigious activity and mental exercise, in which every mind participated, produced a miraculous intellectual fecundity.

Never has Italy shone with greater splendour in the arts and letters, never produced so many men of genius in so many departments. We have spoken of Dante, who sums up all the great thoughts engendered by Christian philosophy; literature, however, cannot keep up such eagle flights; yet during the same age appeared two other great classical writers, to whom, besides their native compositions, we are indebted for the revival of classical literature—Petrarch and Bocaccio. The Italian language, energetic and concise, but somewhat rough and irregular with Dante, became with Petrarch soft and harmonious. The expressions as well as the sentiments acquired softness and purity. Precursor of Ariosto and Tasso, he perfected for them the supple and brilliant instrument created by Dante. With Bocaccio, the Italian prose received a fixed standard and the highest degree of perfection. His *Decamerone* is a masterpiece for invention, ingenious narrative, and acquaintance with human nature. He rivalled his contemporary, the English Chaucer, who displayed equal talents through the medium of excellent poetry. The close of this period is illustrated by the great names of Machiavelli, who, as profound as Tacitus, as elegant as Voltaire, continued the revival of letters commenced by Dante, and prepared a new era that opened with the fantastic poet, Ariosto, and the invaluable historian, Guicciardini. At the same time was commencing the eternally glorious epoch of painting, while Italy was giving an impulse to labours of archæology, ancient literature, and philology.

A few words on each of the principal states of Italy :

VENICE owed her origin to the fugitives who were flying from Attila, and Venice fell, in our time, under the sword of Napoleon, who sold this queen of the Adriatic to Austria. Venice, thus fortuitously formed, gradually became a state, and maintained its independence against the Lombards and Constantinople. The citizens assumed the privilege of electing a Duke, or Doge, and feeling the advantage of their local position, addicted themselves to commerce. It soon became very extensive, and they also became the medium between the

Greek empire and the Saracens. In the ninth century, the Venetians conquered the coast of Dalmatia. At the same time, the acquisition of the body of St. Mark the Evangelist was a most pre-eminent fact of the age, a fact intimately connected, says Daru, with the fundamental institutions of the new republic. The people, in their faith and enthusiasm for their patron, confounded the protector with the fatherland, and the cry of *St. Mark for ever*, became their invocation in all circumstances connected with the glory or misfortunes of the republic.

Afterwards, Venice participated in all the affairs of Italy. Sometimes at war with the Normans, then with the Byzantines; sometimes in favour of Italy; afterwards, supporting the emperor; the republic derived advantage from all circumstances. During the crusades she alone could furnish a fleet and money. Her conquest of the Frioul and Istria, and her possessions in Greece and Syria, gave a vast extension to her commerce. In the meantime, the development of the internal constitution was taking place: judges, under the name of *tribunes*, were subordinate to the doge. They usually nominated the new doge, ratified by the applause of the people. The noble families were divided into factions like the rest of Italy, and contention rose at the election of every doge. In 1032, after a violent struggle, two councillors were adjoined to the doge; afterwards, the tribunes were replaced by real judges, independent of the doge. In 1172, to put a stop to the bloody divisions occasioned by every election, a law was enacted, deciding that eleven from the principal citizens should be selected at every election for the choice of a doge; the people received an indemnity in money. Soon, influential men, assembled round the doges to serve them, were acknowledged as permanent counsellors. From that time the aristocratical constitution advanced rapidly. At the end of the twelfth century the authority of the doge was controlled by six counsellors (the *segnoria*), who, with him, had the initiative of the laws; also, by a supreme tribunal, the *quarantia*, a court civil and political; also by the council of the *invited*

(the *pregadi*), collecting round the doge in important cases; and lastly, by the *great council*, created in 1172, composed of 480 members elected annually by twelve electors appointed by the people; a true national representation. On great occasions the people were consulted, and voted by acclamations. But a century later, a modification introduced in the great council ensured the final and complete triumph of the aristocracy.

This aristocracy did not consist in the old nobles, but in families enriched by trade. The former sunk in obscurity, and endeavoured to recover their rights; a civil war broke out at the death of Doge Dandolo, the commercial aristocracy triumphed, and the great council introduced many modifications and privileges, all to the advantage of this purse-proud body, or trading oligarchy. The authority of the doge received new limits, and the people lost all participation in the government. The whole authority became concentrated in the hands of a few families. In 1315 was created the *golden book*, for the name of all those who were fit to enter the great council. In 1311, in order to check all attempt at revolt or conspiracy, the council of the *ten*, a tribunal of ten inquisitors of state, was instituted; it is celebrated for its devotedness to the aristocracy, its craftiness in discovering all mysteries, and its unscrupulous cruelty. In one word, it was an infernal political police.

In the meantime Venice extended her conquests. She established extensive colonies and vast depôts in the East. She subdued successively all the little principalities that had risen round her: Trevisa, Feltra, Belluna, Verona, Padona, Bergamo, Brescia. She conquered Cyprus. Towards the close of the fifteenth century Venice had attained the pinnacle of power and wealth. But already the discovery of a new road to India injured her commerce. Corruption—that devouring worm that ever follows exaggerated wealth and ego-tism—had penetrated deep into that commercial oligarchy, and the proud republic began to decline rapidly, never to rise again.

GENOA and PISA, rivals of Venice, never attained the latter's lofty supremacy. Their history is similar to that of the other Italian republics. Genoa, torn by internal factions, beheld also the formation of a commercial aristocracy. The nobles were divided into Guelfs and Ghibellins; the people, hostile to both parties, struggled incessantly with them. Such constant commotions gave rise to the strangest changes in the constitution of Genoa. In 1339 a popular movement occasioned the creation of a doge. Nevertheless, the contentions continued; and, in order to restore peace and regularity, the authority was entrusted to the French from 1396 to 1409. In 1407 a celebrated institution was established—the bank of St. George's, or committee, entrusted with all the financial administration of the republic, which became the foundation of the exclusive domination of the money-men. Afterwards, the political and commercial importance of Genoa declined. All her advantages in the East were ruined by the fall of the eastern empire. She was exhausted by her wars with her neighbours, especially Venice and Pisa; at last Louis the Moor, who governed Milan, seized the city in 1484, and Genoa remained under that subjection till the sixteenth century. Pisa had been also highly flourishing by her commerce and enterprises, especially in the twelfth century. Her decline and subsequent nullity arose from her long wars with Genoa, and from her long struggles with Florence during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, to whom she finally submitted in 1509.

In LOMBARDY the aristocracy had grown Ghibelline, which name now implied the cause of the privileged classes. The people, excluded hitherto from all municipal rights, had taken in hand the Guelfic cause. After the death of Frederic II. the Ghibellins were vanquished all over Lombardy, and then came the accession of the democratical authority. At Milan the *captain of the people*, Martin della Torre, had succeeded in securing in his own family nearly the whole authority. From that day republican liberty was lost for Milan, and houses succeeded each other, converting the Milanese into an

hereditary principality. After the death of Martin della Torre, his family endeavoured to keep the authority, but succeeded for a short time only : a civil war ensued, and the family of the Viscontis obtained the sovereignty ; and they remained masters of Milan during a hundred years ; in 1395 Galeazzo Visconti had received from the Emperor Venceslas the title of duke.

Philip-Maria-Visconti leaving no heir, Milan endeavoured to recover her independence ; but his son-in-law, a brave *condottiere*, Francesco Sforza, seized the reins of government, and his family succeeded the Viscontis. In 1476 Galeazzo Sforza, celebrated for his debauchery, cruelty, and cupidity, was assassinated. His brother, Louis the Moor, instituted himself the guardian of his son, and assumed the authority ; he kept the reins of the government, and being threatened in his usurpation, he had the imprudence to call to his assistance the king of France, Charles VIII. (1494.)

FLORENCE occupies the most brilliant place in Tuscany during this period.* In former days this city of flowers held but an insignificant position. A certain number of noble families were at the head of the affairs. Gradually the inferior classes acquired importance by their commerce, industry, and wealth ; the time was not far distant when the corporations of trades were to oppress the aristocracy. In 1215, for the first time, the parties that divided Italy into Guelfs and Ghibellins were formed also in Florence. One Buondelmonti insulted a daughter of the Amidei. The insult was avenged in blood : from that day the nobles, with their contentions, filled the city with troubles and carnage. After the death of Frederic II. the people revolted and proclaimed a Guelfic republic. A captain of the people was elected ; but continual troubles led to the domination of Charles of Anjou, which lasted ten years, and during which the corporations of trades were organised ; they were submitted to a captain of the people and a council of ancients. There existed, also, the *great municipality* filled with nobles, and, moreover, a *po-*

* See Appendix, No. VI. (e.)

destat. Continual disorders were fomented by the nobility. In order to check them, a *Gonfaloniere* of justice, chief of the army, was elected in 1292; his nomination to be renewed every two months: the most severe measures and laws against the nobles were adopted; they were excluded from all public functions. The triumph of the people was not of long duration. In 1294 the rich citizens and the nobles formed a league, and struck down the officers of the people; but the aristocracy of money and that of blood soon divided and came to arms. The Guelf and Ghibellin factions were then revived under the name of *Whites* and *Blacks*. The internal disorders could not be exceeded. A poor wretched adventurer—although decked with the title of duke of Athens, like so many wandering princes at that time—offered his services to Florence, and he was placed at the head of the government: his ignoble despotism and extortions soon rendered him odious to the Florentines, and they expelled him (1343). Long dissensions between the rich merchants, the higher corporations of trades, and the smaller trades and working men, followed. Some of the richer citizens found in the people a useful instrument of their ambition; and at the instigation of several of them, among whom was Sylvester de Medicis, a furious revolt broke out in 1378 which produced a short triumph of the people. A poor woollen working man, Michael Lando, was placed at the head of government, and conducted the affairs with very great wisdom and moderation. But gradually the richer citizens returned into the administration. The constitution, as it may be supposed, had undergone an infinite multitude of modifications and transformations. Although it now assumed a highly popular form, yet the people felt instinctively the necessity of a protector taken from among the most influential citizens. This protector became a master; he was selected in the rich family of the Medicis. These Medicis had acquired great wealth by skilful commercial speculations: they soon became the bankers of Europe. John of Medicis, in the quality of *Gonfaloniere*, became highly popular by a successful war against Milan, and by financial measures favourable to

the poorer classes. He transmitted his authority and influence to his son Cosmo, the father of his country, the protector of the fine arts and letters, who, with infinite skill, preserved the appearance of democratical forms of government. Cosmo's son, Pietro, succeeded his father in 1464, in spite of a strong opposition, and managed to keep the authority. Finally, Lorenzo crowned the splendid labours of the family of the Medicis. He displayed a magnificence hitherto unknown. He employed enormous sums in the embellishment of Florence; no one ever showered down such munificent favours on the artists and literati; most of the men of genius who became the glory of Italy were formed at his court. But liberty was dead at Florence. The aristocratical conspiracy of the Pazzi and of the Pope Sixtus IV., which proceeded by assassination, failed in 1478. After the death of Lorenzo, and when the great Savonarola had established a Christian republic, and caused the expulsion of those rich, corrupt, voluptuous bankers, all the passions united against the poor holy monk; he expired under the torture. The Medicis returned to Florence, and afterwards the city, with the conquered territories, formed the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, created in their favour by the Emperor Charles V.

Many of the Italian feudal lords kept their independence, and two of them became the founders of important principalities; 1. The COUNTS OF SAVOY, who had extended and fixed their domination in the fourteenth century, by inheritance and primogeniture. The counts of Savoy became dukes in 1476, and soon found themselves at the head of one of the most powerful states in Italy. 2. The other house was the family of ESTE, whose centre was Modena; they were aggrandised by furnishing various cities with *podestats*, who afterwards became masters: thus Rovigo and Reggio were subdued. And in 1471 the Pope invested the dukes of Modena with the duchy of Ferrara, that had formed part of the inheritance left to the Holy See by the Countess Matilda.

ROME and the church, independently of the ecclesiastical authority, had also become at the end of this period one of

the first political powers of Italy. We have seen her successive aggrandisement ; a large portion of the inheritance of the Countess Matilda had been annexed to the donations of Pepin and Charlemagne ; Bologna had been acquired in 1360. Since Innocent III., the Papal authority had never been assailed at Rome, in spite of the turbulent nobility and irritable populace of the Eternal City ; but in the middle of the fourteenth century, the democratical impulse that was agitating the whole of Europe found an echo in the city of the Pontiffs, and a resplendent but not lasting revolution revived a shadow of the ancient Roman republic. During the whole of the Middle Ages, discord and hatred between the noble families had brought on the city many bloody dissensions ; the Pope himself had often struggled in the midst of those contentions. When the Holy See was transferred to Avignon, the disorder, troubles and violence had no bounds ; murder, assassination, incendiarism, rapine, and the grossest immoralities, were a constant spectacle beheld in the broad light of the sun. In the midst of this corruption, a young man, of an obscure and indigent origin, but accomplished, eloquent, persuasive—Rienzi, the *last of the tribunes*—attempted a reform. At his voice, the citizens and the people united to check the rapine and violence of the nobles. On Whitsunday of 1342, the crowd was assembled in the church of St. Angelo. Rienzi appeared, accompanied by the bishop, with the standards of liberty, justice, and union ; he ascended the capitol, and proclaimed, in the midst of the enthusiastic acclamations of the people, the restoration of the *good state*, the punishment of criminals, the sovereignty of the people of Rome—leaving to the Pope all his prerogatives. Rienzi was immediately appointed for the execution of the proposed laws : he struck down the nobility, governed with the title of tribune, and sent ambassadors to many princes and kings. The news of this revolution was hailed with universal delight ; the Pope, Clement VI., gave it his approbation, and Petrarch sang the glory of the liberator of Rome. But vanity began to intoxicate Rienzi ; luxury and pomp polluted his faculties. The people

soon evinced scorn and irritation at the tribune's pride and ostentation; the nobles opposed him in arms. The Pope now excommunicated the rebel; the country occupied by the armed nobles sent no provisions; and Rienzi, surrounded by enemies, ignobly fled from the city. After an exile of seven years, and wanderings through the cities of Europe, the emperor detained him as a captive; he was transported to the Pope at Avignon (Innocent IV.), who, after a reconciliation, sent him back to Rome, to aid in the reforms he proposed. Rienzi again was received with an enthusiasm which he soon turned into a bitter aversion by his aberrations. One day, the people, furious, rose in threatening clamour, took the capitol, and massacred the tribune, who was endeavouring to escape in disguise (1354). From that epoch, Rome remained in submission to the Pope, although several conspiracies took place afterwards; but they were null in their results.

NAPLES had been reft, we have seen, from the Hohenstaufens by Charles of Anjou, who, by the Sicilian vespers, lost the beautiful island. Peter of Arragon was proclaimed king of Sicily. In 1295, James of Arragon gave Sicily to his brother Frederic. This collateral branch reigned in the island until 1377, when it became annexed to the kingdom of Arragon. Charles of Anjou was succeeded at Naples by his son, Charles II., who married the daughter of Stephen of Hungary, and had four sons; the first, Charles Martel, ascended the throne of Hungary; the second, Robert, the throne of Naples; and the others became the heads of the houses of Tarento and of Durazzo. After the death of Robert (1309), under the government of his daughter, Joan I., the kingdom became a prey to every disorder. The queen, young, beautiful, and voluptuous, allowed a free course to her passions. She had married a youth void of intelligence and firmness, André of Hungary. One day the young prince was found weltering in his blood, assassinated, at the door of the queen's chamber. Joan, whose fame was already sullied, did not remain without being suspected of the crime, nevertheless she soon contracted another marriage. Lewis the Great, of Hungary, hastened

with an army to avenge the death of his brother André. Joan and her husband took flight after a defeat, but the king of Hungary being unable to maintain himself in Naples, the queen returned from exile, and was received with enthusiasm. Other storms and difficulties, however, soon followed. The Papal schism now divided Europe; the queen of Naples declared in favour of Clement VII.; Urban VI., indignant, excommunicated her, and awarded the kingdom to Charles of Durazzo, her cousin, whom she had loaded with kindness and liberalities. In vain Joan appointed Louis d'Anjou, second son of the king of France (John), as her successor; Charles of Durazzo advanced at the head of an Hungarian army, seized the person of the queen, and had her murdered in prison (1343).

Charles III. became king of Naples and of Hungary, the house of Anjou never ceasing to claim the crown of Naples—a constant source of warfare, which continued under his son Ladislas. The latter had to resist three times the attacks of Louis of Anjou, who, notwithstanding several victories, had not the skill to derive any advantage from his successes. Ladislas, after several conquests in the pontifical states, and when he was threatening Tuscany, died convulsed by horrible pains, caused, according to some, by poison—being, according to others, the consequences of his vices and debaucheries (1414).

After him, his sister, Joan II., proved still more corrupt and degraded than the first Joan. She long opposed the house of Anjou, and had adopted Alfonso (Alonzo) V. of Aragon for her successor. She soon was terrified by his ascendancy and severities, revoked her appointment, and, after great efforts, succeeded in having the Arragonese expelled from the kingdom. She had adopted, instead of Alfonso, Louis of Anjou, and, after him, René, count of Provence. Joan was triumphant. Nevertheless, at her death (1435), Alfonso V.,* *the Magnanimous*, undertook the conquest of the kingdom, and found himself master of it in 1443; he left it to his natural son, Ferdinand

* See Appendix, No. VI. (f.)

(1458). René of Provence, drowned in poetical dreams and the pleasures of Aix and Marseilles, never gave a thought to his fabulous-ideal kingdom of Naples. Ferdinand remained in the possession of it, after numerous vicissitudes, and in spite of the frequent revolts of his disaffected subjects. In 1494 he left it to his son, Alfonso II., who fled when Charles VIII. of France advanced to claim the inheritance of the Anjous; and afterwards he left the kingdom to his son, Ferdinand II. (1495.) Frederic III., uncle of the latter, took the reins of government on the following year, and kept them till 1501, when he abdicated. Naples being conquered by the Spaniards, commanded by the celebrated Gonzalvo di Cordova, general of Ferdinand the Catholic, remained subject to Spain till 1713.

We have in this Chapter explored a very extensive field. We have seen again endless revolutions, convulsions and calamities, all presenting a sad spectacle individually: but when contemplated in the whole, we behold the solemn decrees of Providence working their way silently and solemnly, viz., we behold the progression of all. We become more and more convinced that all those evils tend to the realisation and the accomplishment of the work of truth. We have seen, for instance, in this period, industry and a great movement draw the exercise of the intellect exclusively to material subjects. It would check apparently all intellectual advancement and every mental progress; but not so. On the contrary, the efforts of industry prepared all the issues through which the ideas were afterwards to penetrate and be diffused among humanity. Industry has prepared the swift wings with which spiritualism gloriously travels from one end of the world to the other. All material ruins, all intellectual convulsions tending to an absolute negation, seem ever destined to clear the soil, and to prepare it for the day when Christianity, recovering its ascendancy, sows the pure seed of truth.

Some ages seem particularly destined to constant and unheard-of calamities. Thus, the fourteenth century witnessed

a multitude of disasters. Times of great misery had existed before ; but at a more barbarous and distant period. The year 1000, for instance, had universally been expected as the end of the world. The doom was hailed as a refuge in God. All aspirations were concentrated in the awful day, which was to end all disorders and wretchedness ; humanity was to obtain peace—the peace of death. The serf, oppressed and famished, the monk in his abstinence, the captive in his dungeon, awaited with calmness the decrees of divine justice. The tranquillity of faith and hope had replaced the frenzy of despair. The years immediately before and after the year 1000 were marked by fearful calamities. At first, a horrible plague, which caused the flesh to become putrid and fall from the bones before life was extinct, assailed the population of Aquitaine. Afterwards came a famine : it ravaged the whole of Europe, during which children and the weak were attacked, seized, roasted, and devoured. In the market of Tournus, human flesh was publicly sold. Nevertheless, the world did not end, but all hearts were softened : there was a general return to feelings of pity, mercy, and of toleration. Religion assumed a prodigious, omnipotent ascendancy. The church was morally re-constructed, and materially also, by the enormous gifts and donations offered in expiation.

The close of the twelfth century beheld Christianity and civilisation again on the wane. The material struggle between papacy and the empire had been detrimental to religious faith. The hollow scholasticism of the period only engendered divisions and scepticism. The people, left to grovel, often seemed brutalised ; it was the period of all those extravagances, such as *the feast of the fools*, monstrous disguises, obscene exhibitions, that can scarcely be credited in our time ; a moral plague was reigning. In the meantime, common sense, rejecting those aberrations, manifested itself in gleams of liberty, but under a fantastical, convulsive, strange aspect. Anarchy was reigning. In the thirteenth century, the feudal nobles and Innocent III. restored political and religious unity with fire and sword.

The thirteenth century is illustrious by the general progress of Europe under the auspices of St. Louis in France, Rodolf of Hapsburg in Germany, and Edward I. in England, and by the mendicant orders protesting against the corruption of the clergy, and displaying the loftiest Christian virtues.

The fourteenth century beheld catastrophes of a gigantic character. We will not speak of those of China and Asia. Egypt, Syria and Cyprus were annihilated by earthquakes that scarcely can be conceived of by imagination. In 1342, extraordinary inundations ravaged a great part of Europe. In 1345, the order of seasons seemed totally changed; an incessant rain of four months brought on a famine. In 1348, the whole of Europe was shaken by fearful subterranean convulsions. Some of the largest cities of Italy were half destroyed. In Carinthia, thirty towns and villages disappeared; mountains moved away, and fell. Afterwards, more than half, often two-thirds, of the population perished from the plague and from famine. Read some of the details in Boccaccio and Petrarch. Europe was prostrate with terror. The *Flagellants*, fanatics who had commenced in 1260 to preach baptism with blood, now emerged again in masses; they were seen in crowds, in all the cities of Europe, naked in the streets, flagellating themselves, their blood streaming, calling the people to repentance.

But let us reverse the medal, and only give a summary political glance on Europe in the fourteenth century. We behold a general yearning for justice to all the children of God; popular revolts protesting against the iniquities of the rich and great; they are the dawn of the great movements of the Christian nations in modern history. It opens with William Tell and the liberty of Switzerland, 1308; then we behold the enterprise of Arteveld in Belgium, commenced in 1336; Rienzi restored a republican government at Rome in 1347; the popular conspiracy of Marino Faliero at Venice was crushed in 1355; the *Jacquerie* in France took place in 1358; Michael Lando assumed the government at Florence

in 1378 ; the insurrection of Wat Tyler and Jack Straw in England belongs to the year 1385.

The fifteenth century is characterised by a great tendency to centralisation, to unity, and to the formation and preponderance of general interests and public authority. It beheld the first permanent relations, combinations, and alliances between governments. This new feature among the European nations became highly favourable to royalty. The conduct of external affairs naturally fell into the hands of the king. The people, exclusively occupied with their efforts in having a share in the internal administration of their own affairs, never thought of interfering in the external relations. Thus, the centralised power of the crown is very distinct from the prerogatives claimed by the nation. These characteristics, thus gradually developed, during the fifteenth century, without any apparent symptoms, prepared the revolutions of modern Europe.

CHAPTER VIII.

Third Period continued.—Spain.—The Spaniards.—The Goths subdued by the Arabs.—Pelagus.—Khalifate of Cordova.—Civil Wars among the Arabs.—Formation of the Spanish States.—Partitions.—Navarre.—Arragon.—Castille.—Portugal.—Constitution of Spain.—The Fueros.—The Nobility.—The Clergy.—The Cortes.—The People.—The Spanish Language and Literature.—Arabic Influence in Spain.—Scandinavia.—Conversion of Scandinavia.—Barbarism of Sweden and Norway.—More advanced State of Denmark.—Victories of the Danes.—Union of Calmar (1397).—Subjection of Sweden.—Gustavus Wasa.—Scandinavian Constitutions.—Languages and Literature.—Iceland.—The Sagas.—Poland.—The Race of Piast.—Influence of Christianity.—Wars of Poland.—Her Constitution.—Casimir the Great.—His Death (1370).—The Jagellons.—Casimir of Lithuania (1447).—His Civil Institutions.—Character of the Polish Monarchy.—Extinction of Poland.—Russia.—Her Origin.—Novogorod.—Ruric (850).—Wladimir the Great (980).—Russia converted to the Greek Church.—Russia under the Mongolian Yoke from 1224 to 1477.—Ivan the Terrible commences the System of Russian Absolutism.—Accession of the House of Romanow (1613).—Hungary.—The Race of Arpad.—St. Stephen, the Hero Legislator (996).—Magyars embrace Christianity.—Progress of Hungary.—Finally annexed to Austria, in 1527.—Constantinople.—Extinction of the Greek Empire.—Prospects of Christianity in the East.—Third Period concluded.

WE have hitherto studied the outlines of the Christian civilisation on the greatest stage of its progressive movements :—viz., central Europe. We have now, previous to entering into modern history, to behold the growth and development of Christian principles in the nation of secondary importance ; which, much later, assumed any preponderance in the European affairs. Our object, therefore, in this Chapter, will be

to take a bird's eye view of the histories of Spain, Portugal, and of the north of Europe.

The establishment of the Visigoths in Spain is not forgotten. They had crossed the Pyrenees towards 507, and their empire, chequered by a variety of troubles, dissensions, and moments of prosperity, existed till the commencement of the eighth century. In 709, Roderick, *the last of the Goths*, became the possessor of the Gothic crown; after him the kingdom fell a prey to the Arabs. From that day until the close of the fifteenth century, the Christians of that country were actuated by one thought—one effort—the expulsion of the infidels. Nevertheless this Peninsula remained divided longer than any other part of Europe, although its inhabitants tended to the same object during nearly eight centuries, and with the indomitable perseverance which characterises the Iberian race. To this national sympathy and object, must be added the characteristics that are common to all the inhabitants of the Peninsula: the same language, the same religion, the same courage, with its ancient Spanish stubbornness, the same faith in God and mistrust of men, and that humble heritage, patience, which nations transmit to each other, till the dawn of better days. Such is the moral patrimony common to all Spaniards; such is the moral unity which forms an indissoluble tie between all the provinces, in spite of their profound dissimilarities, and their long divisions.

The Arabs, during the greatest flush of their memorable victories, effected a landing in Spain. Masters of a part of Asia, and of the whole north of Africa, they had long coveted that rich Andalusia. Muza, the governor of Africa, was invited over by a party of traitors, who wished the ruin of the king of the Goths, but not, in all probability, the total subjection of their country. Muza, and his general Thareck (*Al-Taric*), landed in Spain with an army, and defeated the first Gothic troops they encountered. Whilst terror and desolation were reigning on all the coasts, trampled down by the Arabs,

Roderick was collecting all his forces, and advanced to meet the foe. The two armies fought during three days—eight according to some historians—at Guadalete, or *Xeres de la Frontera*, near Cadiz (714), with equal fury on both sides. Finally, the defection of two Gothic chiefs became the signal of the confusion and slaughter of the Goths. Roderick disappeared in the *melée*, slain, according to some, whilst resisting with heroism, his crown on his head and purple mantle on his shoulder; but escaping, according to tradition, and ending his days, long after, in penitence, as a hermit, amidst the wild mountains that separate Andalusia from Portugal. (See Southey's Poem and learned Notes on the subject.) Popular tradition will not credit the fatal end of those who have long been a source of terror or wonder, mixed with sympathy—Roderick, King Arthur, Roland, Charles the Rash, Frederic Barbarossa. According to popular traditions, Frederic Barbarossa did not perish on the field, but lived long in secret and hallowed solitude. Some of the admirable *romances* of King Rodrigue are very popular in Spain at this very day.

Thareck soon subdued all southern Spain: and here we bid adieu to the Goths; for, when a tiny monarchy and a new Christian people emerged in the Asturias, no more is heard of the Goths; but we behold a Spanish king and Spanish people—a compound of the Gothic and old Roman races. The soldiers of Pelagus (Pelayo) who fled with him into caverns—inaccessible defiles, and did not despair of their country, appeared afterwards, united by the same faith, the same name, the same idiom, the same love of independence, the same hatred of the invaders. On the other hand, a multitude of Christians had hailed the Arabs, submitted to them and embraced their religion—too happy to be allowed to be governed by their own laws in their civil affairs. But Arianism, it may be remembered, had penetrated deeply among the Visigoths; and the general laxity it engendered had prepared the facile acceptance of the Koran. The Spanish nationality required to be regenerated, and this regeneration

was accomplished through a long series of misfortunes. On one side, we find, in the eighth century, a race of Mohammedans, powerful, opulent, accomplished, well organised, possessors of the whole territory : on the other, a handful of men, comparatively barbarous, but followers of Christ, devoted to their religion, and maintaining their freedom with almost incredible heroism. In the fifteenth century the conquerors and masters, with their crescent, had disappeared, and what remains of them is lingering on the African soil. The handful of Christian fugitives, followers of Pelagus, had grown into a powerful nation, acting at once a pre-eminent part in the European affairs.

During the eighth century Mohammedanism was in its most magnificent period of expansion and conquests : it threatened the whole of Europe, when Eudes and Charles Martel (732) forced the oriental tide to roll back. The invasion of France had taken place under the last khalif of the house of Ommeyah, whose officers were governing Spain—the two last of whom had perished in the disastrous war : various pretenders to the dignity of *emir* (governor) appealed to arms. Conquerors and conquered suffered from the civil war and oppression. It was the time when a revolution at Damascus gave the khalifate to the house of Abbas, and of the general massacre of every male of the family of Ommeyah ; one youth only, Abderrahman, escaped to Africa. After seven years of exile and sufferings in the desert, he was invited by the partisans of his family into Spain, where he landed in 755. He soon found himself at the head of an army, easily overcame all opposition, and founded, at Cordova, the seat of his khalifate, being, in a religious and political point of view, opposed to that of the Abbassides, at Bagdad—both parties proclaiming themselves the only true and legitimate successors of the Prophet.

Abderrahman I. thus became, by his khalifate of Cordova, the founder of one of the most vigorous branches of Islamism ; he derived his military force from the Moors of Africa, of whom more than 200,000 came over successively to Spain.

His successor, Hischem (787-796), continued his organisation, and consolidated also the sovereignty. Under Alhakem (796-822) and Abderrahman II. (822-852), civil dissensions began to trouble the rising prosperity of the eastern domination of Spain. They continued, or rather broke out again, at various times, during the reigns of Mohammed (852-886), Almondhir (886-888), Abdallah (888-912). But Abderrahman III. (912-961), and his successor, Alhakem II. (961-976), and Hischem II. (976-1002), with his great and powerful minister, Almansour, elevated the Mohammedan domination to the highest degree of splendour, prosperity, and magnificence. It was the period when the court of Cordova was adorned by a multitude of poets, literati, and learned Arabs. There the philosophy of Aristotle, astronomy, medicine, alchemy, botany, were universally cultivated. The refinements of intellectual culture were blended with Arabian luxury and pomp, as well as with the undaunted valour of the followers of Islam. It was the time when the most celebrated monuments of the Arabian art were raised: the mosque of Cordova,—the Alhambra,—the Alcazars of Grenada and Seville. No doubt the eastern writers and poets may have been guilty of some exaggeration in their description of those splendours—almost surpassing the tales of the Arabian Nights. Nevertheless, the recent researches of the German orientalists have confirmed enough for us to brood over the wonders of the Eastern civilisation with admiration.

The dynasty of Ommeyah was not of long duration. Under the reign of Hischem II., the hero-minister, Almansour, by his superior administration, and twenty-five years' victories, shed a surpassing lustre on the domination of the Arabs. Christian Spain had descended to the lowest stage of misery and degradation, when suddenly it rose and avenged, in one day, a long series of disasters. The princes of Castille, Navarre, and Leon, united their forces, and met Almansour and his army at *Calat-Anozor*, in June 1002. Here, after a terrible and obstinate battle, the Christians triumphed. Alman-

sour was mortally wounded ; and with him perished the dazzling prosperity of the khalifate of Cordova. Soon after, a civil war broke out among the emirs ; they all struggled for their independence : and, after thirty years of warfare among each other, the last khalif was deposed (1031). Moham-medan Spain was divided into nine separate principalities. What could be the causes of the sudden fall of this magnificent empire ? It was extensive, and possessed force and unity, but it was characterised by the same hollowness that has been the ruin of so many others ; namely, absence of faith, or the presentiment of its short duration ; and its force and unity were only artificial and temporary, in consequence of their being the work of one man, Almansour, instead of resulting from the moral energy and progress of the masses.

Let us return to *Pelayo* and his fugitive Christians.

Pelagus was related to the last royal race of the Visigoths, and gradually found himself at the head of a very small independent state in the mountains of Asturias, with the title of king, in 719. But all that portion of history is merely traditional. Tradition, however, is often truer than written records ; it has transmitted to posterity numerous adventures, expeditions, and victories over the Arabs. Nevertheless, much uncertainty surrounds the whole. In 760, Oviedo was taken from the Arabs by Fruela. In 918, under Ordono II., Leon became the capital of the state which took that appellation ; it, therefore, became the kingdom of Leon, afterwards augmented by the annexation of Galicia ; and, in 1038, after the death of Bermudo III., was united with the county of Castille, founded, it is believed, by a German knight, who probably had come to Spain towards the end of the eighth century, and had constructed something like a borough (*Burgos*), the Latin name of which (*castellum*) became that of the province.

The Spanish chroniclers and historians are very uncertain about those primitive states. They speak of a former kingdom of Arragon, founded by the Visigoths, during the first

half of the eighth century, which even waged war with Charlemagne. But all this is very doubtful, as well as all that is related about the small state of the count of Bigorre, which must have been of very little importance, since it is not even mentioned by the historians of Charlemagne. The Spanish provinces, near the Pyrenees, could alone assume a rapid extension; and it was only at the time of the expeditions of the great emperor of the Franks, that the Christian power in that country may be said to have obtained any degree of importance. Charlemagne had subdued the country as far as the Ebro, and constituted the states of Barcelona and Catalonia, with Navarre and Arragon in their dependence. When the Carolingian empire split in so many parts, the counts of Barcelona rendered themselves independent and hereditary. Near them soon arose the counts of Bigorre, who, under Garcia I., took the title of kings of Navarre; and the counts of Arragon, who claimed their origin from a son of Odo, or Eudes of Aquitaine. At the commencement of the eleventh century, these two states, holding formerly of Barcelona and Catalonia, had extended considerably, and grown more important than the county that was their suzerain. At this time Navarre was preparing the union of all the Christian states in Spain. Sancho III., *el mayor*, son of the king of Navarre, inherited Arragon from his mother Urraca; he married afterwards Nunnia, heiress of Castille; and his eldest son, Fernando, husband of the sister of the king of Leon, could, after the death of the latter, transmit to his posterity the whole of Christian Spain, with the exception of the county of Barcelona. Unfortunately, before the annexation of Leon to the other states could be consolidated, a new division took place, which was to be followed again by other subdivisions. This constant partition was a fatal proof and result of the hostilities existing between the Christian princes, and Christian Spain had almost as much to suffer from the incessant wars that the reigning houses waged against each other, as from the struggles with the Arabs. The passions of the parties, and self interest, often led to monstrous alliances. The

Mohammedans were frequently allied with the Christians against Christians, and several of those alliances were even sealed by matrimonial bonds between the followers of Mohammed and those of Jesus Christ! Without such facts, the resistance of the Arabs could not possibly have lasted so long.

Sancho *el mayor* divided his kingdom between his four sons (1035). Navarre was given to Garcia, Castille to Fernando the Great, Sobrarbo to Gonzales, and Arragon to Ramiro. The latter soon obtained possession of Sobrarbo, at the death of his brother. Thus there only remained three kingdoms, Navarre, Arragon, and Castille. They existed separately, notwithstanding some temporary re-union, until the fifteenth century.

The history of *Navarre* does not offer much interest. Situated as it is at the feet of, and partly in, the Pyrenees, its geographical position prevented all possibility of extension at the expense of the Arabs. Arragon and Castille were the foundation of Modern Spain. Navarre passed into various houses, owing to the female inheritance. After the extinction of the male line, it fell to Thiebaut of Champagne, then to the royal house of France, afterwards to that of Evreux, to that of Arragon, to the house of Foix, and finally to the house of Albret. Higher Navarre (south of the Pyrenees) was conquered in 1512 by Ferdinand the Catholic, and Joan of Abret brought but a vain title with Lower Navarre (Basques) to the house of Bourbon.

The male posterity of Ramiro reigned during 100 years in *Arragon*. Among the sovereigns of that line, Alonzo I. is celebrated for his victories over the Moors. In 1137, Petronilla, heiress of the kings of Arragon, gave her hand to Raymond Berenger, count of Barcelona, and by this annexation of Catalonia, Arragon fell under the French influence. The counts of Barcelona had long since thrown off their allegiance to France, but they possessed numerous fiefs in that country. They acquired others by purchase, or alliances, such as Roussillon and Provence, and notwithstanding the subsequent

partitions, the relations between the two countries continued to grow more and more intimate. Among the princes of the house of Barcelona, the most illustrious was Jayme I. (1234-1276). He conquered the Balearic Islands and the kingdom of Valencia from the Moors. The Arragonese historians speak with enthusiasm of his virtues; they maintain that no greater man ever honoured a throne. Jayme no doubt deserves their praise as a soldier and a general. From his youth to his death his sword was constantly drawn for the defence of Christianity. He won thirty pitched battles over the Moors, and was the founder of more than two thousand churches in the conquered territories. He was great, generous, but immoral. He committed also the fault of dividing his crowns among his children; and a great blot on his memory is the introduction of the Inquisition in Arragon. Under Pedro III. (1282), Sicily, after the massacre of the French, gave herself to Arragon. Under Alonzo III., who went to his grave in 1291, with the surname of the *Munificent*, or the *Magnificent*, owing to his boundless prodigalities, Minorca was taken from the Moors, and soon after Sardinia was also subdued. Those various provinces were generally given as fiefs to collateral branches of the family. They nevertheless shed a great lustre on the royal house. Under the reign of Martin, they were all finally united to the crown, and with him ends the dynasty of the counts of Barcelona; the kingdom of Arragon, with its fiefs, passed into a branch of the house of Castille, and the fourth king of that family, Ferdinand the Catholic (Fernando), had the glory of re-uniting the whole of Spain.

The kingdom of *Castille* was more especially the centre of the wars waged against the Moors; there, also, the fatal system of territorial divisions checked the progress of the country; nevertheless, Castille never ceased to be aggrandised by the provinces conquered from the common foe. The French chivalry had a great share in all those military expeditions and victories in Castille, as well as in the other Christian states of the Peninsula. On the whole, French influence is one of the most marked characters of Spain during the Middle

Ages. The reigns of Fernando I. of Castille (1035-1065), of his successor Sancho (1065-1072), and of Alonzo VI. (1072-1109), were fatal to the Moors. It is the epoch of the famous Don Rodrigo Diaz el Vivar, the favourite hero, the Roland, of Spain—the *Cid*, whose fabulous deeds are related in a multitude of Spanish chronicles. The *Chronicle of the Cid* has been rendered into English by Robert Southey. Alonzo VI., surnamed the *Shield of Faith*, won thirty-nine battles during his reign; after six years of a persevering blockade and of ravages, he had the glory of beholding the fall of the impregnable city of Toledo, which became the new capital of the kingdom (1085). The selfish divisions among the emirs were favouring the triumphs of the Christian arms.

Islamism revived for a short period. The emirs of North Africa, and Mauritania, had rendered themselves independent, and founded various principalities, like those of Algiers and Tunis. A religious revolution came to unite all those states, and re-act upon Spain. A chief of fanatics of the Almoravides (*zealous for the Faith*) raised a standard in the desert, and acquired a formidable influence; his successor, Youssouf, founded the kingdom of Morocco (1069). Ben Abed, king of Sevilla, the most powerful of the Mussulman states, called them to his assistance against Alonzo VI. of Castille; they came, but turned their arms against the Arabs themselves, subdued the whole of Mohammedan Spain, and kept at bay the Castilian chivalry (1108). Their success, however, ceased soon after. A new sect arose, opposed to theirs—it was that of the Almohades; these, in their turn, took Morocco (1157), and attempted also to conquer Spain. They were crushed by the Christian kings. Alonzo VI. had been obliged to yield before the formidable fury of the Almoravides. At his death, however, a French house ascended the throne of Castille, in the person of a son of the Infanta Urraca and Raymond of Burgundy. The French chivalry flocked into Spain; the war against the infidels rallied all parties; then, especially, the military organisation of Spain was developed. The whole Spanish nation became an army marching against the Moham-

medans. It is the time of the formation of several religious orders, such as those of Alcantara, of Calatrava, &c.

Those efforts, although so general and ardent, were neutralised under the first princes of the house of Burgundy by the divisions among the principalities, and the civil wars caused by the ambition of a few powerful and arrogant families, principally that of the Laras. Finally, under Alonzo VIII., Pope Innocent III. published a crusade against the infidels; the troubadours called all the chivalry to arms; the united forces of the Christian princes, recently reconciled, won the great battle of Tolosa, or *Las Navas* (1212), and inflicted a mortal blow on the Almohades. Alonzo died two years after, worn out by the fatigues of warfare. After the short reign of three years, and accidental death of his son Henrique, Fernando III., the Saint, continued, till 1252, the conquests of Alonzo: Cordova, Murcia, Seville, Cadiz, fell into the hands of the Castellans. Alonzo X. (1252-1284), the wise, the scholar, the legislator, the romantic hero of many valuable chronicles, added the Algarve to the conquests of his predecessors, and triumphantly repelled a new invasion from Africa—that of a new sect that had overthrown at Fez and Morocco the authority of the Almohades. Alonzo X. had been elected emperor of Germany in 1257. The only Mohammedan state that remained in Spain was that of Grenada. Castille afterwards remained long plunged in a continued anarchy; internal divisions and civil wars wasted the national activity, and all the latter part of this period offers nothing more than a series of endless and cruel disorders. In 1368, the bastard branch of Henry of Trastamarre occupied the Castilian throne after the murder of Peter the Cruel, who had been vanquished with the assistance of the French; yet the contentions and dissensions continued until the day when the marriage of Isabella of Castille with Ferdinand of Arragon (1469) prepared the union of those two kingdoms, which took place in 1479.

The kingdom of *Portugal* was established in the Peninsula very near those of Spain. It was a French creation—the immediate result of the war against the Moors. Whilst the

Norman knights were founding their domination in Italy, a French prince came to lend the assistance of his sword to the Castellans, and with it carved out for himself a very fair appanage, namely, the country of Portugal (1094-1139). Henry of Burgundy, great-grandson of King Robert of France, came, along with other French knights, to serve under the banner of Alonzo VI. of Castille; he signalised himself at the capture of Toledo, and by new exploits against the Moors of the Duero, and in that part of Gallicia which had long borne the name of Portugal, derived from *Porto-Cale* (o'Porto). The king of Castille gave to the illustrious foreigner the hand of Dona Theresa, his natural daughter, and the investiture of all the lands he had conquered and could conquer. Henry of Burgundy, after seventeen battles fought against the Moors, remained master of all the territory between the Duero and the Minho. After his death, his widow, Dona Theresa, aggrandised the inheritance of her son, and the latter, Alonzo-Henriquez, *the Conqueror* (*el Conquistador*), achieved the work commenced by his father. On the point of giving a great battle to the Moors, Jesus Christ appeared to him, promised him the victory, in saluting him with the title of king. The army proclaimed him king with acclamations; and at this battle of Ouriquez he obtained a complete victory over five Moorish princes. A national assembly, held at Lamego (1143), sanctioned the military election of Alonzo, and issued a fundamental law of the kingdom, which regulated the succession of the crown. Alonzo, after having subdued Beira and Estramadura, established his residence at Lisbon, which he conquered in 1147, with the assistance of an army of crusaders brought by an English fleet. This great prince was approaching the end of a long and arduous life, when an invasion of Saracens (1184) threatened the very existence of Portugal; but the victory of Santarem saved that youthful monarchy. At the commencement of the thirteenth century, Alentejo was conquered, and, later, the Algarve, and these conquests gave to Portugal the limits it still preserves. But, as well as in Spain, the internal dissensions checked the pro-

gress of the nation. The kings of Portugal took part in the internal quarrels of Castille, especially in that between Peter the Cruel and Henry of Trastamarre. At this same epoch, a bastard branch ascended the throne of Portugal, in the person of John the Great (1385). Peace was restored, and it prepared the short but glorious part acted by Portugal at the commencement of the following period, by which this nation was of real utility to humanity.*

The *Constitution* of Spain during the Middle Ages is characterised by a general spirit of exclusiveness and federalism, by the remaining traditions of the Visigoths, and a military organisation harmonising with the character and object of the nation. The ancient law of the Visigoths, the *Forum judicum*, although abrogated during the eighth century, continued as a law in Christian Spain, and remained the basis of the subsequent municipal legislation. The *Forum judicum* was translated into Spanish, under the title of *Fuero judzgo*, hence the celebrated word of *Fueros*, a name that has been given indiscriminately by the Spanish chronicles to the usages and customs not written, although having force of law, to the local charters, and to the charters of royal institutions, but only taken by historians generally, as expressive of this last sense. The origin of the Spanish municipalities was simply this: the cities and villages being very rare on the ravaged territories, inhabitants could only be persuaded to settle on those deserts by the grant of extensive franchises, the only bulwark that could protect them. The Christian princes, therefore, thus granted a fuero to the new colony; this fuero being the richer in privileges as the settlement, or new city, was exposed to dangers. These municipal charters created in Spain a class that did not exist before, a sort of bourgeoisie, the *vecinos*, neighbours or associates. The first written fuero was that of Leon, granted in the council of that name by King Alonzo V., in 1020, the most ancient monument of Spanish jurisprudence. It bears the first traces of the feudal

* See Appendix, No. VII. (a.)

system; many of its articles being borrowed from foreign legislation. The fuero of Burgos was granted by Fernando I. in 1039. But the most important and most popular fueros were granted by Alonzo VI., the conqueror of Toledo.

The general tendency of all those charters was to limit the authority of the lords, and extend that of the king. The right of administering justice belonging to royalty, but extorted afterwards by the nobles, it was at last conceded to the municipalities by their fueros; and it was exercised by the *alcades*, whom they appointed. The civil laws were very much mixed with old Germanic customs that were revived. The purely Spanish character among them consisted in the details, intended to promote population and the family spirit, without which the municipalities have no strength. But the municipal attachment carried to excess is highly detrimental to any patriotism and a general love for the country. The stranger who had remained without the limits of the fuero was soon considered as a foe, and severely prosecuted by the local laws. Moreover, rivalries and hereditary hatreds divided all those small independent republics, jealous of each other; and the divergence that existed between the customs and laws among them added to the causes of divisions, and nourished that exclusiveness, narrowness of mind, and proud obstinacy, a terrible instance of which we have had in our time, when the government of Spain has struggled during ten years to obtain a general submission to a liberal constitution and to unity.

The war against the Moors was the great bond of unity between the Christian princes of the Peninsula. It was a regular crusade excited by religious and political views; it lasted four centuries, and was carried on with that patient perseverance which characterises the Spanish nation. The military body, centre of all the Spanish states, became the stock of a military nobility that soon divided itself into several classes, principally in those of the higher nobility (*ricos hombres*) and of the chivalry (*hidalgos*). After them came the higher and governing bourgeoisie, offspring of that combination of the law of the Visigoths, the fueros; and below them stood the

people, who enjoyed none of those privileges. But above the nobility and the municipalities, the clergy appeared, and re-assumed its authority as the Christian arms were victorious. The clergy soon became, as everywhere else, the first of the orders of the state. The national councils were reformed; the popes entered with interest into all the affairs of Spain; and the religious orders found in that country, where they became very numerous, an extensive field for their activity, pious zeal, and unbounded ambition.

The Spanish nation had also its states-general, namely, the *Cortès*, an assembly that collected round the king, and was composed of the clergy, the higher and lower nobility, and the representatives of the nobles of the cities. The institution of the *Cortès* was variously developed in the different kingdoms of Spain: it reached a higher degree of perfection in Arragon; but everywhere it became an institution purely aristocratical, and a guarantee for the local liberties against the national authority and unity. In Arragon the power of the nobility was such, that one of its members, the *justizia*, the judge between the nobility and the king, could tell the king, when the latter was installed, "We, who are as much as you, and are worth more, we make you king, on the condition that you will respect our privileges; if not, no." The mass of the people, therefore, were not represented at the *Cortès*; nevertheless the condition of the peasant was more tolerable in Spain, than in the other countries of Europe. The ancient cultivators of the land had disappeared; they had been massacred, or had enfranchised themselves, during the endless wars and ravages, and the continual subversions of the people. The serfs, who afterwards appeared in Spain, were treated as everywhere else, with the exception that they were not irrevocably tied to the land, and had the liberty of quitting their master and leaving the country. On the other hand, slavery continued to be the fate of the prisoners of war who were not Christians.

According to Sismondi (*Literature of the South of Europe*), the intellectual development of Spain was the offspring of

French influence. When the counts of Barcelona ascended the throne of Arragon, this kingdom became also the fatherland of the poetry of southern France—the Provençale poetry. The language spoken was the same, and is still spoken there, and is known as a dialect of the Spanish—the *Limousin*, or Catalan. In Castille, on the contrary, the language became different, although formed with the same elements, and it engendered the Spanish and Portuguese tongues of our time. Castille, as well as Provence and Catalonia, produced a multitude of songs, romances, fugitive poems and epics. The national tradition of the *History of the Cid* became the groundwork of all epic poems, and of the most ancient and the most celebrated monument of Castilian poetry, namely, the *Poem of the Cid*, written towards 1112. Several of the kings of Castille were themselves poets, and their efforts contributed greatly to the development of that literature which under the French and Italian influence reached its fullest bloom during the middle of the fifteenth century.

The long contact and frequent union of the Spaniards with the Mohammedans have left indelible traces on the spirit of the Spanish nation and on Spanish manners. The influence of the church and of Christian Europe could not dispel from that Christian nation deep tints of Arabian tastes and Arabian enthusiasm. The Moors had often taken their wives from among the Spaniards. Many Christians had been seen abstaining from pork, and circumcising their children, in order to please their masters. The fatalism of the Koran has also left an impression on Spanish manners, and produced that singular mixture of the Spanish character—extreme passibility in action, and an extraordinary presumption and pomposity in language. The Mohammedan characteristics are found in most of the habits and manners of the Spaniards:—in that cold resignation with which they give and receive death, in their profound dissimulation, their sobriety, contempt for sufferings, their patience, calm vengeance, and their exultation in success and triumph. The private life of the Spaniards abounds also in oriental habits; their voluptuous dances are

merely the amusements of the harem rendered public; the nightly serenading seem derived from the mysterious amours of the Arabs; in short, their dark jealousy and ardent passions have also a Mohammedan character. No doubt this strange and incoherent mixture of Spanish and Arabian manners has been the principal cause of that absence of progressive energy, a deeply-marked feature that distinguishes Spain from the other Christian nations.

SCANDINAVIA.—For reasons before explained, we must be permitted, by a sudden transition, to turn at once to the North, and commence with the kingdoms of the Scandinavian Peninsula, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. The Scandinavian kingdoms (*Scanzia*, *Scandia*) assumed at a very early period a distinct form, and their modern appellations. Their inhabitants were very long before they divested themselves of their primitive barbarism, and it is after the fifteenth century only that they appear with any importance in the general history of Europe. The sources of their primitive history consist exclusively in traditions, and are extremely numerous, as well as vague and uncertain. They have been the points of departure for the national historians of Denmark and Norway—Sueno Ageson of the twelfth century, Saxo Grammaticus (died in 1204), and Snorro Sturleson (died in 1241). Olaus Ericson, the most ancient national historian of Sweden, wrote during the middle of the fifteenth century. Besides these scanty documents, all that is to be found consists in a few chronicles and lives of saints, and some fragments of foreign historians. The most important epoch in the historical antiquities of Scandinavia, and the most memorable, from the extraordinary revolutions it accomplished, is the arrival of Odin, the Mars, as well as the Mohammed, of Scandinavia, the author of a new civil and ecclesiastical system, and who was elevated after his death to divine honours. A full account of that fabulous age can be found in the *Scandinavia* of Messrs. Wheaton and Crichton, and in Mr. Carlyle's *Hero-Worship*.

At the time of Charlemagne, the Germanic manners were reigning in Scandinavia with all their rudeness and ferocity.

The population was divided into independent tribes, whose martial nature was manifested by sanguinary struggles among themselves, and by those maritime excursions which later rendered the name of *Northmen* so formidable over the whole of Europe. Charlemagne had to oppose a powerful Danish prince, and also to bridle the restless hordes of the North. It was with this view that he founded what has since been the rich and flourishing city of Hamburg. In the peace that Charlemagne concluded with the Danes he was disposed to impose his religion upon them, in order to reclaim them from their wild and barbarous habits, but he feared that it would have been rejected by them as a badge of slavery. Louis the Debonair received an exiled prince of Jutland, Harald, and induced him to renounce the errors of Paganism. Soon after he sent a missionary to the North ; but the intrepid monk and his proselytes were persecuted and massacred. Swedish ambassadors came afterwards to implore that missionaries might be sent to their country, and this time the Christian religion found numerous adherents in Scandinavia. Nevertheless, it was only a century later that Christianity was finally and generally adopted in Scandinavia. Knut, better known by his designation of Canute the Great, had the glory of being the first to abolish the abomination of human sacrifices, and to lay prostrate all the images of Pagan deities and their temples (1018).

Nothing could be darker and more repulsive than the character of northern society during the heathen ages. With Christianity a new era was introduced. Here, as well as everywhere else, it commenced a religious, civil, and philosophical reformation ; it corrected the abuses of an ill-regulated freedom ; it banished vindictive quarrels and sanguinary dissensions ; it humanised the public laws and softened the ferocity of private manners ; it emancipated the peasantry from a miserable servitude—restored to them their natural rights ; it communicated a knowledge of letters and imparted an idea of happiness independent of sensual gratifications ; it created a relish for the blessings of peace and the comforts of life ; in

short, it sowed the seeds of a complete regeneration in the habits, customs, arts, and institutions of the North. But external wars and long internal broils caused, during a very long period, the desolation of the kingdoms of Scandinavia. Partitions among the sons of the kings; the pretensions of Sweden and Denmark over Norway; every species of interested dissensions of fratricidal strife and insatiable ambitions, were a long obstacle to the full growth of the fruits of Christianity. This disorderly and fatal state of things lasted during three centuries. Norway, that had formerly sent forth the most numerous and martial bands, was daily becoming feebler. Sweden, which afterwards acquired so high a reputation as a military power, was weak and obscure. In 1056 a new dynasty ascended the throne, in the person of Stenkil: afterwards another, in that of Sverker, in 1155: finally, in 1250, the powerful clan of the Folkungar usurped the sovereignty, and kept it in their family till 1389. Nevertheless, under Saint Erik (1161) Finland had been conquered and converted; and under King Magnus, *Ladulaas* (1278), Gothland was united to Sweden, and he was the first who took the title of King of the Swedes and Goths.

The progress of Denmark during this period was alone really great. The successors of Canute the Great followed in the track of their illustrious ancestor; they long remained a formidable foe of Germany; they attacked especially the shores of the Baltic. Waldemar I., the great, the founder of Copenhagen (1157-1182), defeated and subdued the Wends or Winidi—Venedi or Vendland (Slavonians), who extended along the southern shore of the Baltic from the Gulf of Finland to the Elbe, and forced them to embrace Christianity; he conquered Rugen, Stettin, and part of Pomerania. His death was lamented by all Denmark. The *Krugtlinga Saga* says that he fought more than twenty-eight battles in the heathen land, and warred against the Pagans, to the glory of God's church, so long as he lived. Waldemar II., the victorious (1202-1241), continued the victories of the Danish arms; he conquered the island of Oesel and part of the coast

of Prussia. Valdemar III., co-regent with the former, conquered part of Esthonia. The Holstein and Courland acknowledged the Danish supremacy. But long internal broils came to interrupt the course of their prosperity, when the *union* concluded at Calmar in 1397 seemed to ensure for ever the unity, power, and prosperity of Scandinavia.

Magnus II., king of Sweden and Norway, had been driven away from Sweden, and taken prisoner by Albert, duke of Mecklenburg (1365); but he preserved Norway, and left that crown, as well as his pretensions over Sweden, to his son Olaf, who reigned under the guardianship of his mother, Margaret of Denmark. The male line of the kings of Denmark becoming extinct at the same time, the Danes elected this same Olaf, son of their Margaret. But soon after the premature death of her son, Margaret herself was elected sovereign of Denmark and Norway, and assumed the title of Queen of Sweden, in right of her late husband, and prepared to appropriate the throne of that kingdom. She defeated Albert at the battle of Falkioping (1389), and made him prisoner; but Stockholm, assisted by the Germans, resisted, and only surrendered to her after the treaty of Lindholm. By the treaty of Calmar, which followed, the union of the three Scandinavian kingdoms was to be perpetually maintained, each kingdom, nevertheless, preserving its special laws and constitution.

A new epoch in Scandinavian history commenced with the *union* of *Calmar*, under the celebrated Margaret, whose address and extraordinary talents have been illustrated by the surname given her, of "the Semiramis of the North." Her government, wise and firm, ensured order and submission during her lifetime, although Denmark enjoyed a great ascendancy, whilst the Swedes were treated like a conquered rather than a confederated nation. When she died, therefore, in 1412, she was far from being endeared to the people of Sweden, although her memory was long cherished by the Danes. Under her successor, Erick, the Danes and Swedes revolted; he was deposed by both the Swedish diet and the Danish senate, and Christopher of Bavaria proclaimed sove-

reign of the confederate kingdom (1440). Eight years after, Christian I. succeeded him in Denmark; and Sweden in the meantime became a prey to faction and anarchy; Charles Knutson usurped the throne (1448), from whence he was finally expelled in 1470, after incessant troubles and sanguinary strife; and Sten Sture, a native chieftain, distinguished for his talents and valour, became administrator of the kingdom. Christian I. having died in 1481, his son John (Hans) assumed the reins of government, and the sovereignty of the three crowns: with a formidable army and fleet he invaded Sweden (1497); he compelled Stockholm to treat, and was crowned king of Sweden and Gothland, Sten Sture being permitted to retain his vast fiefs and feudal revenues. The union of Calmar, so often broken and renewed, was once more ratified by the most solemn sanctions. But the ill-dissembled discontent of the Swedes soon revived; the barons had been arbitrarily deprived of their fiefs and castles, the people insulted and oppressed. Sten Sture, beloved by the peasantry, became the leader of a general insurrection. John failed in his attempt to check it. In the meantime the revolt spread also in Norway (1502), where John dispatched his son, Prince Christian, with an overwhelming force: the revolt was suppressed, and followed by executions, tortures, and confiscations. Christian afterwards marched into Sweden, and laid waste the country with unsparing cruelty. The war between the two states became implacable, only interrupted occasionally by pretended negotiations. Sten Sture, the noble vindicator of his country's freedom, having died in 1503, he was succeeded by Svante Sture, another distinguished chief of the same clan, who governed as viceroy till 1512. Christian II. became king of Denmark by the sudden death of his father, John, in 1513. The Swedish senate refused to acknowledge him as their king, and Christian invaded the kingdom, laid siege to Stockholm, and returned to Copenhagen with several Swedish nobles whom he had treacherously seized. In 1520 he returned to Stockholm with an overwhelming armament, surrounded by military adventurers from every part of Europe.

The Swedes were dispersed, the country overrun and laid waste with every atrocity, sanctioned by a Pope's Bull. Some of the Swedish nobles implored a truce, and a compact was signed, renewing the treaty of Calmar.

Christian was crowned at Stockholm as sovereign. The festivals on the occasion lasted three days; the king had granted a charter of pardon and oblivion, but the perfidious and bloody tyrant had prepared a massacre; on the 8th November 1520, at the signal of the castle bell, a multitude of ecclesiastics, senators, knights and burgomasters were slaughtered; among the senators was Erik, of the old royal blood of Sweden, father of Gustavus Vasa. The latter escaped, wandered about in poverty, disguised as a peasant; he sought an asylum as a common workman in the copper mines of Dalecarlia; made himself known to the multitude, roused their patriotism and enthusiasm, and marched at their head. Gustavus Vasa was the deliverer of his country; he was unanimously called to the throne, and with him commences the glorious period of the Swedish annals, which belongs to modern history.

The long dissensions of the Scandinavian states were a great obstacle to the development of the constitution. A military organisation of the subjects, and a military as well as elective sovereignty, were the basis of the Scandinavian constitutions. The frequent communications with civilised Europe—the alliances formed with the sovereigns of the South—the commercial relations with the Hanseatic cities, gradually introduced the ideas and customs of Southern Europe. The constitution of Denmark is, I believe, the most ancient. The Danes had during their heroic ages a national council, where, indeed, until the time of Waldemar I., the peasantry came armed, and exercised their political rights with as much freedom as any noble in the land; but this independent bearing, which was tolerated in the patriarchal simplicity of ancient times, gave offence to the aristocratic pride of the later epoch, when the cultivators of the soil gradually sunk under the increasing power and influence of the feudal chiefs and of the

clerical hierarchy. During the reign of Erik Glipping (1282), the Danish chiefs convoked a diet at Nyborg, where they extorted from the sovereign a formal act defining their privileges as well as the limits of the royal authority, which served as a model of the capitulations (*Haandfestning*), always signed by the Danish kings at the time of their coronation. Erik Glipping granted charters of incorporation to several of the principal towns, and promulgated a general law for the regulation of municipal bodies throughout the kingdom. Nevertheless, serfdom, and even slavery, existed in Scandinavia. The organisation of Sweden and Norway was very similar to that of Denmark. In Norway, Olaf (Kyrre) the Pacific (1093) contributed much to the civilisation of his subjects; he established a commercial emporium at Bergen, and founded several guilds or fraternities of arts and trades, which ultimately ripened into municipal corporations. He also made a law to facilitate the emancipation of that unfortunate class, so long held in a servile condition; by the terms of this regulation, every district, or *Fylke*, was obliged to set free one bondsman annually. Norway had, moreover, a legislator in Magnus Hakonson, the *Lagabæter*, or the Law-mender (1280), who collected everything relating to the public or constitutional statutes of the kingdom into a regular code, called the *Hirdska*. The government of Norway, like that of Sweden and Denmark, had been gradually assuming the form of a sacerdotal and feudal aristocracy. Soon the high clergy and nobility became masters of the governments, and instead of enfranchising the serfs, they, on the contrary, made every effort to reduce the free peasants to the state of serfdom. This tendency was, in some degree, arrested by the able policy of the princes of Norway, who asserted the rights of the monarch against the encroachments of the clergy and the nobles.

Magnus, the Law-mender, caused also to be compiled from the customary laws prevailing in the provinces a general body of civil and criminal jurisprudence for the entire realm, in one book. The forms of judicial procedure recognised by this code bear a striking similarity to that of Jutland, promulgated in

Denmark by Valdemar II., in 1240. We have stated that the civilisation of Scandinavia had been arrested by its long, turbulent, and unsettled state: the land was laid waste—property insecure—industry and agriculture neglected—commerce monopolised by the Hanseatic merchants—and the little learning of the period confined to the monks and clergy, who wrote in wretched Latin. The nobles were then accustomed to send their sons, destined for the clerical profession, to be instructed at Paris. The age of the Waldemars, however, marks the epoch of a great change in the language and literature of the North. In the reign of Waldemar II., the vernacular tongue began to be formed as a distinct language, differing from the old Scandinavian in grammatical inflections, though remaining nearly the same in its vocabulary and idiom. The constant intercourse with numerous Northern races, and the influx of monks and Christian missionaries, engendered a diversity of popular dialects, which still exists. The missionaries had endeavoured to obliterate every allusion to Paganism by the disuse of the Runic alphabet. Waldemar II. was the last of the Danish monarchs who entertained as guests the Icelandic *Skalds*, whose national songs and glorious recollections of old Denmark's heroic age were replaced by the minstrelsy and lays of the *Minnesingers*.

In Sweden, the causes that retarded the progress of the language, letters, and civilisation, existed to a greater extent than in Denmark or Norway. In the thirteenth century, the inhabitants of the cities were chiefly Germans. This intercourse tended to arrest the development of the vernacular germs. Even her progress in policy and manners did not take place until the sixteenth century; prior to that epoch, her whole history is a wretched chaos. The royal authority tended gradually to increase until the accession of Margaret, but no measures were adopted for promoting the happiness of society, facilitating the administration of justice, rendering private property secure, and opening up channels of national prosperity. Nothing was done to enlighten the people, or soften their manners, because the clergy were more warriors

than scholars. The Swedes did not even know how to work their own iron; the ore was conveyed to Prussia, in order to be forged into bars. Agriculture and commerce were in a state of almost total neglect; nevertheless, the peasantry were enfranchised in Sweden earlier, perhaps, than anywhere else. In the year 1335, the state of slavery was abolished by a law of Magnus Smek. It was during the reign of Gustavus Erikson that the Swedes first acquired a taste for knowledge, and began to cultivate the arts and peaceful improvements. The Reformation cut off the sources of those disturbances which the wealth, pride and ambition of the Romish prelates had formerly created. Most of the ancient nobility had been extirpated either by civil wars or in the massacre of Stockholm, and there only remained a new generation full of native vigour and candour, and imbued with new ideas and new principles.

The last gleams of the ancient Scandinavian spirit shone in Iceland. This secluded land had been discovered and occupied by the Norwegians and Swedes at the commencement of the tenth century, and soon after it received Christianity, and with it the elements of a new civilisation. In Iceland flourished the last bards of the North;—there were heard the last songs of ancient Scandinavia. We are indebted to the Icelanders of that period for the collection of the *Sagas*, imitated from the romances of chivalry, and combining the fictions of Scandinavian and Teutonic antiquity. The fabulous exploits of the heroes of the *Volsunga* and *Vilkinasaga* were, indeed, previously known to the Northmen, and had formed the subject of the *Eddas*, or Eddaic lays, long before the story of the German *Nibelungenlied* had been embodied by poetic fancy—at least, in its present comparatively modern form. Even the institutions of chivalry itself seem to have arisen spontaneously in the countries of the North, independently of any intercourse with the Southern Gothic nations, who had established themselves on the ruins of the Roman empire. Commerce and navigation flourished also in Iceland, but it wasted its growing vitality in internal quarrels; it was subdued by Magnus VII.

of Norway in 1262, and the dawn of civilisation that had appeared in the midst of its ices and snows vanished.*

POLAND.—At a very uncertain period, numerous hordes belonging to the Slavonian race had established themselves on the vast plains bordering the Oder and the Vistula. The Polish nation emerged from those independent tribes. Its primitive history is very obscure, and consists in vague traditions. All the Slavonian tribes, although divided among themselves, were united by one common bond—the choice of a supreme chief, taken from the royal race of Piast. This Piast had been a peasant—a honey-merchant; his dynasty reigned in Poland till 1370, in Moravia till 1526, in Silesia till 1575. The Polish nation, more than any other in the North, received from Christianity its first impulse and the first elements of its formation and character. The Othos of Germany were endeavouring to extend their frontiers, and to convert their barbarian neighbours; missionaries were sent to Poland, and soon after Miecslas (*Mieczyslas*), duke of the Polonians—the Clovis of Poland—embraced Christianity, united the various tribes, and converted them. The idols were abolished, a clergy established, churches constructed;—such were the first steps of the new nationality (965). His successor, Boleslas I., the great, who has been called the Charlemagne of Poland, took the title of king (1024); he crowned himself, and died the following year, after a reign of twenty-five years, during which he gained the most splendid victories, and triumphed over the whole of Germany. With him a new era commenced for Poland. His institutions have made him illustrious as much as his conquests. He divided the kingdom into districts, each with a governor charged with the civil and military administration. Like Charlemagne, he had a council of the crown, who judged all the civil and criminal affairs brought before the justice of the king. He founded a great number of schools, and his zeal for religion and the diffusion of the Holy Scriptures has been celebrated by all the historians.

* See Appendix, No. VII. (b.)

Boleslas II. and Boleslas III. extended the Polish sway by the force of arms. In every direction, tribes were subdued and converted to Christianity. The Slavonian populations of Silesia, Moravia and Lusatia were annexed to Poland. The Poles penetrated among the Russians—even among the nations of the East; and a part of Pomerania was conquered, and accepted the Christian faith.

This brilliant period of prosperity ceased with the life of Boleslas III. (1139), who committed also the great fault of dividing Poland among his three sons. Here commences the celebrated anarchy of Poland; this partition was the real commencement of the rivalries of the provinces, of the variety of customs and manners, and local pretensions which later became a source of discord much more difficult to eradicate than the mere personal pretensions of the nobles. Immediately after this partition, extensive feudatory states were formed in every direction. The kingdom became divided and subdivided by incessant discords and strife among the higher nobility. This long turbulent period, which we cannot follow, lasted until the accession of Wladislas Lokietek, who, after long struggles, was crowned king of Poland, at Cracow, in 1320. Poland, however, in spite of the internal broils had acquired Gallicia, and repelled an invasion of Tartars. The Prussians, still barbarians, had been attacked, and the knights of the Teutonic order called against them; the grand master engaged himself to conquer Prussia for Poland; but Prussia, once conquered, the Teutonic knights refused to acknowledge the sovereignty of Poland. Hence the numerous wars which long raged afterwards.

Wladislas Lokietek became the restorer of Poland. He was generally successful in his wars, although he lost Silesia. He re-established the ancient form of government, namely, the unity of the monarchy; all the principal dukes acknowledged his supreme authority. His son, Casimir the Great, crowned at Cracow, in 1333, continued in the steps of his father; he signed a truce with the knights of Prussia, and the first years of his reign were tranquil. At a diet in 1339,

he proposed his nephew Louis, son of the king of Hungary, for his successor, who was accepted after having signed a sort of constitutional charter, considered as the first of the celebrated *pacta conventa* of Poland. In the year 1347 the celebrated council of Vislicza was held, in which the whole Polish legislation was reformed. The authority of the palatines and judges was limited; and scandalous judicial abuses reformed. Casimir, having incurred and braved the censures of Rome with regard to his private morality, internal troubles became the inevitable consequence of episcopal influence. The Lithuanians and Russians, profiting by these circumstances, assailed him and threatened Cracow. The king of Poland rushed to the field of battle, and defeated them. The war continued till 1366, when, by a treaty, Poland acquired Podolia and Volhynia. Casimir the Great died in 1370; he left some of the wisest civil institutions of that nation; he was the guardian of the people oppressed by the nobility, and curbed this proud body, whom he forced to yield and obey. They gave him, as a lofty sarcasm, the surname of *king of the Peasants*; Casimir accepted it as a homage, and he exerted himself to the utmost to be deserving of it. With him the dynasty of Piast ceased to reign in Poland.

Louis of Hungary had never wished for the crown of Poland; his idea was that two flocks could never be well guarded by one shepherd. He remained in Hungary, and his reign of twelve years over Poland is not distinguished by any external event; yet it was fatal to the Poles, from its leaving a free course to the tyranny of the great over the people, in the absence of the king. At his death (1382) an interregnum ensued; after which, the Poles, in order to baffle all the rival ambitions, offered the crown to Hedwige, youngest daughter of the late king, who yielded at the same time to the pressing solicitations of the whole kingdom, and accepted for her husband Jagellon, brother of the grand duke of Lithuania (1386). Jagellon (Wladislas II., 1386-1434) and his brother were Pagans; they both became Christians. Paganism was extirpated at Wilna, and that duchy annexed

to Poland, and, despite the subsequent discords, the two countries remained united until the modern partition. Jagellon signed the *pacta conventa*, and during his reign, and that of his successors, Poland attained her highest prosperity. A war soon ensued with the Teutonic knights. Jagellon defeated them in the famous battle of Tannenberg (1410), where 40,000 of the knights and the grand master were slaughtered. His reign, of forty-eight years, was, on the whole, one of the most magnificent in the history of Poland. It was about this time that were held the first *small diets*, or primary or local assemblies, in which the nobles of the provinces deliberated previously, on the questions to be proposed at the next diet. The reign of his son Wladislas III. (1434-1444) is filled by two great events—the annexation of Hungary to Poland, and the crusade against the Turks. In the latter, the king of Poland perished, and his army was exterminated at the fearful defeat of Varna, in 1444. From that year till 1447, Poland had an interregnum. At last Casimir of Lithuania accepted the crown, and permitted the nobility to augment considerably their prerogatives; the whole conduct of the affairs was in their hands, and consequently, when they were actuated, not by the national interest, but by their private egotistical views, the anarchy became deeper, whilst the inhabitants of the country and cities were a nameless multitude, completely null. This fatal system was the cancer which brought Poland to her grave.

The great fact of this reign was the incorporation of Prussia with Poland by the treaty of Thorn, 1466, after a war of thirteen years, during which 7,000 Prussian villages were plundered and burnt, and the Teutonic order trampled down. The grand master became the vassal of Poland. But the civil institutions of Casimir of Lithuania must not be forgotten; one especially—the establishment of the chamber of the envoys (1468). Hitherto the diets had not been submitted to a regular form; he fixed their functions, and decided that no one could be admitted to them without a special mandate from a city or province; but these mandates

were granted by the nobles only: so that the nobility alone was represented in the diets by the envoys. Casimir died in 1492, and his son and successor, John Albert, in 1501. It was during his reign that it was decreed at a diet that no citizen of the cities could acquire any territorial property, because it gave an electoral right, and many having purchased estates had begun to oppose the exclusive interests of the nobility in the diet. From that day no middle class could shelter the serfs and lower people from the merciless despotism of the nobility. Alexander, whose short reign came after that of his brother Albert (1501-1506), was assailed by the Tartars, who were defeated. He promulgated the decree known by the name of *Statuum Alexandrinum*, which destroyed the last prerogatives of the Polish crown, and left the whole government to the senate and the diets; thus all the laws and decrees were enacted by them, and all the public charges borne by the peasants and the citizens.

A word more on the Jagellons: Sigismund I. (1506-1546) succeeded his brother Alexander. The Teutonic order rose from its prostration. The war was renewed. Frequent wars, without decisive results, were also waged with the Prussians, and the Tartaric invasions repelled. Sigismund II. (Augustus), who continued successfully the hostilities with Sweden and Russia, died in 1572; and with him the illustrious race of the Jagellons became extinct. Poland afterwards remained an aristocratical republic and elective monarchy. That unfortunate country never ceased declining, until the fatal crime of the partition in 1772. We have said enough, however little, to exhibit the roots of an incurable evil. The greatness of that country arose from the development of the aristocratical principle; but the exclusiveness and abuse of that principle became the source of a fatal anarchy. The aristocracy being especially martial and immoral, with scarcely any middle classes, and the people in abject moral and physical slavery, and therefore without energy, the influence of Christianity was powerless; the nation was losing its elements of vitality and real means of resistance, which can never be

replaced by the mere military heroism of a certain number of men. Then the crafty and unprincipled neighbours of Poland, who long contributed to foment her anarchy, mutilated, limb after limb, the nation that had so long arrested the Russian, Tartar and Turkish invasions. Those cruel neighbours three times struck her without mercy, and, finally, inflicted the decisive blow in the heart.

RUSSIA.—Numerous tribes of Slavonic origin appear to have inhabited, from an early period, the districts of European Russia. The *northern* Slavonians founded the city of Novogorod, which long remained the metropolis and centre of the North. The *western* Slavonians established themselves between the Elbe and the Baltic Sea; their principal tribes were the Obotrites, the Lusatians, the Pomeranians, the Moravians, the Tscheques (*Chekh-Czechi*), who drove away the Marcomans from the country of the Boi, and took the name of *Bohemians*—the Polonians or Poles. The *southern* Slavonians came from the shores of the Black Sea, and made their appearance in the north of Dacia; they were subdued by the Avars; but, when the latter were defeated, near Constantinople, in 626, they revolted against their oppressors, and the emperor Heraclius allowed them to settle in Illyria. Such is the origin of the ancient duchies, or Slavonian governments, of Croatia, Dalmatia, Esclavonia, Bosnia, and Servia.

Novogorod, and the northern Slavonians, were incessantly exposed to the incursions of the Northmen of Scandinavia. Russia, now the most perfect model of absolutism, was then a flourishing Republic. Novogorod was governed by magistrates freely elected by the people. All the populations of the North brought to this ancient and opulent city, merchandise, products of every species, and gold, in exchange, or as a tribute. The Russian republicans, however, called to their assistance the Swede Ruric (or *Hraerak*), who rendered himself master of Novogorod and of the whole state (850). Kief and its territory fell also a prey to one of the Scandinavian chiefs. Ruric consolidated his authority by many successful

expeditions; he left to his son Igor, four years old, the title of king, and the regency to his relation Oleg, who aggrandised the inheritance of his ward. The conquests of Oleg, it is true, were not very important; most of the Russian cities consisted in an agglomeration of wooden cottages. The authors of the ancient Russian chronicles say, to *cut a city*, instead of to build a city, as we might say to cut or carve a beam or a mast; the art of building consisted then in cutting down trees, carving them a little, joining them, and in covering the whole with moss. Oleg took Kief by treachery, and ordered its princes to be butchered in presence of his young ward. Kief became afterwards the centre of the empire of the Ruric dynasty. Oleg undertook, subsequently, a bold expedition. In 904 he appeared under the walls of Constantinople with a numerous army. The emperor, Leo the Philosopher, purchased the retreat of the formidable foes; and Oleg returned to the North loaded with treasures and excellent wines. He governed during thirty-three years. At his death Igor assumed the supreme authority; he also undertook an expedition against the Greek empire, and his army ravaged Asia Minor, where they spared no one—massacred and tortured all. When gorged with plunder and blood, they were in their turn attacked, consumed by the Greek fire, and obliged to retreat. However, pacific communications were established, and Christian missionaries soon arrived from Byzantium and Rome. Igor's son, Sviatoslaf, succeeded him, and reigned twenty-seven years, always sword in hand, a savage hero, who subdued the countries washed by the Tanaïs, the Borysthenes, and the Danube; he finally was himself defeated, slaughtered, and his skull transformed into a drinking cup. After him his conquests were lost in the confusion of a civil war: and with Wladimir the Great (980), commenced also the reign of Christianity in those barbarian regions. It is the first flourishing epoch of the grand duchy of Russia. Wladimir had listened fervently to the monks of Constantinople, and he adopted the Greek tenets of the Catholic church; he gave a body of laws to the Russians, and

promoted their advancement in the arts and manufactures. The grand duchy of Russia, comprising then all the Slavonian population at the east of Poland, and nearly a hundred cities, seemed prepared to assume an important character in the affairs of Europe. But it was not so. Barbarism was too deeply rooted in those regions, Christianity too feeble with them, and the tribes divided, and under the government of chiefs all independent. Wladimir divided his duchy among his twelve sons (1015). A fearful anarchy ensued, and the state was more and more divided in private principalities. Among these, the most important was that of Lithuania, later annexed to Poland. Novogorod recovered her prosperity, and introduced republican institutions in the government. The Russians however, exhausted by their internal dissensions, remained defenceless against the terrible invasion of the Tartars-Mongols; they were annihilated at the terrible battle of Kolka (1224). Karamsin, the historian of Russia, relates that most of the Russian princes had fallen in battle; all the wives of the nobles were reduced to slavery and to the most menial labours, the children thrown under the hoofs of the Mongolian horses to perish. The Mongols ravaged afterwards Poland and Hungary with an indescribable ferocity; 20,000 young maids formed part of the booty.

The Russians remained under the Mongolian yoke; towards the end of the fourteenth century they endeavoured to shake it off. The grand duke, Demetrius, gained some advantages. Finally, in 1477, Ivan (Wasiliwitsch) I. effected the liberation of his country. He afterwards abolished the republican constitution of Novogorod, and then commenced that system of absolutism so firmly established in our time in that vast empire; as extensive, says M. de Humboldt, as the part of the moon visible to us. This Ivan I. (1477-1533), and his successor, Ivan II. (1533-1584), were the regenerators of Russia. The progress of civilisation became rapid, and has never ceased. The arts and manufactures of the South were introduced into the North; scholars came also to give a taste for intellectual culture. The army was submitted to a disci-

pline; the musket was substituted for the bow. Communications were opened with Persia, India, and China. But these commencements of civilisation were accompanied by circumstances that characterise the Muscovite civilisation. Ivan II. was at once the Louis XI. and the Caligula of the Russian empire, but more crafty than the former, and with a more furious cruelty than the latter. The opulent Novogorod being suspected of having entertained an idea of giving herself to Poland, Ivan the *Terrible* had the principal inhabitants placed in an enclosure prepared for the purpose, which he afterwards entered with his son and guards on horseback, and began to slaughter till they were exhausted. The ice of the river was broken afterwards, and hundreds of others plunged in the cold stream. Moscow, also suspected, became a scene of carnage and torture: 300 of the most illustrious citizens, and hundreds of others, were either thrown in boiling water, or burned alive, or cut to pieces, in presence of Ivan; 800 women were drowned; dogs were trained to devour the dead bodies. Ivan had an indescribable pleasure in contemplating those who were suspected while they had their flesh slowly torn off, or carved out, or were plunged repeatedly and rapidly in boiling water, in order that the torture should be of long duration. This civilising monster subdued the Tartars of Kasan and Astracan, and added to his dominions the extensive region of Siberia, which was discovered in his reign. In his reign, also, the port of Archangel, in the White Sea, was discovered by an English navigator, and a commercial intercourse opened between England and Russia. His son, Fodor, having died, and his younger brother, Dimitri, having been murdered, Boris, their brother-in-law, ascended the throne (1598); but he was defeated and put to death by an adventurer, who pretended to be the murdered Prince Dimitri, and who found numerous partisans. The pretender was killed in a popular tumult. A period of great confusion followed; the Poles invaded and overpowered Russia; after a long struggle they were expelled, and Michael, prince of the house of Romanow, was elected czar (1613).

HUNGARY.—The nationality of the Hungarians does not often appear with any weight and importance in European affairs. A few words, therefore, on the subject will suffice, although it is not from the absence of documents and works relating to their history. On the contrary, they abound on that interesting country. The Germans possess several estimable histories of Hungary, among which we may name those of Engel and of Gebhardi.

We have spoken of those populations of an uncertain origin, who assailed Europe at the time of the dissolution of the Carolingian empire. Among them, the *Magyars*, or Magiars, emerged from Asia, and established themselves near the Don. Being expelled from those regions, they penetrated into Ukraine, from whence they were driven away by the Russians, and then arrived in Dacia, under the name of Hungarians (889). At the head of the Magyar hordes was the princely race of Arpad. The tribes were seven in number, each being commanded by a chief, almost independent. Christianity penetrated among them under the reign of Geysa I., who was christened towards 980. But the general conversion of the Hungarians to Christianity took place under their great king, St. Stephen (996), who was at once their apostle and legislator, and the true founder of their monarchy. Stephen introduced into Hungary, as much as possible, the manners and customs of Europe. He established a military organisation similar to that of Germany, and transmitted to his son the title of king, conferred upon him by the Pope. The posterity of Stephen reigned until the close of the thirteenth century, during which period Hungary subdued the Slavonian populations of Croatia, Servia, Dalmatia. In the meantime the internal dissensions were incessant. The power of the higher nobility, of the *magnates*, had grown excessive and intolerable, and the royal authority very feeble and tottering as well as in Poland, while nothing could be more wretched than the condition of the serfs, who were Slavonians. That state of things had not much changed in our time, until very recently. The difference of race, the feudal pride of the

aristocracy, and the wrongs and sufferings of the labouring serfs, have always been the great obstacle to the final unity and independence of Hungary.

The male line of Arpad ceased with André III. (1301.) The right of succession to the Hungarian throne came by the female line to the house of Anjou, then reigning at Naples. King Robert, therefore, became king of Hungary, and was succeeded by Louis the Great, one of the most celebrated among the Hungarian kings. Louis very successfully interfered in the affairs of Italy, considerably aggrandised the Hungarian domination towards the South, and had himself elected king of Poland. But all those glorious advantages terminated with Louis. His son-in-law, Sigismund of Luxembourg, who later became emperor, succeeded him, and after his death the rights to the crown of Hungary passed with his daughter into the house of Austria, by whom, however, the Hungarian sceptre was not held without interruption. After the death of Albert V., and under the minority of his son, the posthumous Ladislaus, an illustrious general on the frontier, John Hunyades, who had acquired an European fame by his glorious victories over the Turks, became governor or regent, and his son, Mathias Corvinus, at once a consummate general and the great propagator of enlightenment in Hungary, succeeded Ladislaus. After him came a Polish prince, king of Bohemia, Wladislaus (1490). It was only in 1527, under Charles V., that the house of Austria seized again upon Hungary; from that time it has never ceased forming part of that great monarchy; but preserving her constitution and institutions.

CONSTANTINOPLE AND THE ASIATIC CONQUERORS.—We must bid a last adieu to the royal cradle of Christianity in Europe, and say a few words on the extinction of the shadow, still called the Empire of the East, or Greek Empire. The Greeks had but a feeble portion of Asia Minor left. Towards the end of the twelfth century, all the territories they had lost were divided into several independent Mohammedan principalities. In one of them, Ertoghrol, chief of a Turkish horde,

received a grant of land, and established himself in a part of ancient Phrygia ; his son Osman, or Othman (hence *Osmanlis* and *Ottomans*), soon extended his dominions, and became the founder of a power which made Christian Europe tremble more than once (1309). Osman, among other conquests, took Brusa from the Greek emperor. His son Our-Khan (Orchan) added largely to his territories ; he subdued a large portion of Asia Minor. The Turkish princes announced themselves as the defenders of the faith of Mohammed. They were already formidable neighbours for the Greek empire. Our-Khan instituted the function of Vizir, or *slave of the Sultan*, whom he invested also with an unlimited authority. He formed also the celebrated body of the Janissaries (*Jenicheri*), terrible militia, recruited among the Christian children torn away in warfare, and who, without country and any family ties, were blindly devoted to their chiefs.

The emperors of Constantinople had endeavoured to live in peace with their dangerous neighbours, who, by the capture of Gallipoli, had already a footing in Europe. Michael Paleologus, the restorer of the Greek throne at Constantinople, vainly attempted to unite his church with that of Rome. The Byzantine empire, obstinate in its separation from the West, growing more and more disorganised, and torn by internal factions, prepared its own ruin. Amurat I. (Morad), successor of Our-Khan, advanced into Europe, took Adrianople, made it his capital (1359). The Servians were defeated at the battle of Cossova. In the meantime, Bayezid (Bajazet), *Ilderim*, or “Lightning,” succeeded. He continued the conquests of Amurat along the Danube. Then arrived the great Christian army, reinforced by the noblest chivalry of France and Germany, commanded by Sigismund, king of Hungary. A bloody battle was fought, in which the Christians experienced a disastrous defeat, at Nicopolis (1396). Bayezid was merciless ; his pride flushed with triumph, he prepared to besiege Constantinople, but returned to Asia, to oppose the terrible Mongolian, Timur-Bek, a greater *scourge of God* than Attila.

The ferocious hordes of Mongols came from Central Asia.

Already, in 1206, a great conqueror had collected them, whose great victories rendered him celebrated under the name of Djengis-Khan, *the Greatest of the Khans*. He conquered China and Russia; Poland resisted more successfully;—the battle of Liegnitz exhausted both parties. After him, the Mongolian empire was divided, and anarchy had ruined most of those states in Asia, when Timur-Bek-Tamerlane, of the Usbeck Tartars, said to be descended from Djengis-Khan, appeared in the environs of Samarcand. After the conquest of Persia, India, and Syria, he was invited by the Asiatic princes to protect them against the Ottoman power. Timur came, and defeated Bayezid at the battle of Angora (1402). The sultan was made prisoner, and died in captivity; and his sons, moreover, struggling for the Turkish possessions, the Greek empire had time to breathe.

Mohammed I., however, restored the Ottoman prosperity. His son, Amurat II., subdued most of the Byzantine territory, and defeated, we have seen, the Hungarians and Poles at the great battle of Varna (1444). The Greek emperors felt that the fatal hour was fast approaching; they made the utmost efforts to unite the two churches, but vainly; the obstinate Greeks rejected all conciliation, and the Latins sent no succours. Finally, when Mohammed II. ascended the Ottoman throne, the signal was given for the destruction of the ancient empire. Mohammed II. advanced on Constantinople; after a terrible struggle, the city fell into his hands (1453), and has been ever since the capital of the Ottoman empire. Thus was extinguished the Eastern empire of the Romans—thus fell Constantinople, the first Christian city, after having subsisted 1123 years. “Her religion,” says Gibbon, “was trampled in the dust by the Moslem conquerors.” But in that dust dwells an immortal spark—an eternal germ that will break forth later, after the complete organisation of the Christian civilisation of Europe; it will cast an eternal shade over the Crescent; it will illuminate and regenerate the East. When our political dissensions have subsided—when our social state shall be perfectly purified, and the present tendencies to materialism

exhausted—then we believe the European populations will instinctively return to nature;—the thrice fertile bosom of Asia will receive gratefully our pacific and laborious experience, while the ardent Asiatics, who have hitherto followed the doctrine of Mohammed, will hail with their native enthusiasm and loftiness the banner of Christ.

CHAPTER IX.

Fourth Period in the History of Europe and of Christian Civilisation.

—Character of Modern History.—The Sixteenth Century.—Revival of Letters.—Poggio.—Invention of Printing.—Results of the Classical Pursuits.—Architecture.—Painting.—Music.—Literary and Scientific Revolutions.—Copernicus.—Galileo.—Discoveries of the Portuguese.—Progress of Commerce.—Columbus.—Conquests and Atrocities of the Spaniards.—Settlements of the French, Dutch, and English.—State of Europe.—Spain.—Unity of Spain.—Queen Isabella.—Accession of Charles.—Italy.—France.—Louis XII. (1498).—Venice.—Francis I. (1515).—Charles V., King of Spain, elected Emperor of Germany (1519).—War.—Battle of Pavia (1525).—War in Italy.—Progress of the Turks.—Renewal of the War.—Peace of Crespy (1544).—Henry II. of France (1547).—Philip II. of Spain (1556).—War.—Peace of Cateau Cambresis (1559).—Royal Prerogatives in France.—Polity of Charles V. and Philip II. of Spain.—Results of the Reign of Charles V.—State of the Church.—Martin Luther.—His Attacks on the Pope and Clergy.—Diet of Worms (1521).—Influence of Luther.—His Separation from other Reformers.—The Anabaptists.—Thomas Munzer (1533).—The Protestants and Huguenots.—Diets of Augsburg and Worms.—Hostilities between Catholics and Protestants.—Victories of Charles V.—His Despotism.—Peace of Augsburg (1555).—Death and Character of Luther.—General Advantages of the Reformation characterised by M. Guizot.—Calvin and Calvinism.—Council of Trent (1545).—The Jesuits.—General Reformation in the Roman Catholic Church.

WE are now entering modern history, and the fourth period in the history of Christian civilisation. A totally new spectacle is offered to our investigations. Hitherto the progressive movements of the European nations have been directed by individuals: Constantine, Clovis, Charlemagne, Gregory VII., and others, exercised a special influence for the diffusion of

Christian civilisation; the agencies of those great men were *power* and authority, while St. Francis of Assize tended to the same object through *love*, and St. Thomas Aquinas through *intellect*—faith and devotedness being the general characteristics of the masses.

But with the sixteenth century commences the era of modern genius—the authority of a public opinion, and the progress of sciences. That age beheld the ravages of Italy by the mercenary bands of Francis I. and Charles V., the annual devastations of Suleiman, then the terrible religious dissensions that penetrated into the very heart of nations, of cities, and even in families, arming against each other father and son. In the exclusive contemplation of those scenes of blood and ruins, Europe seems on the point of plunging again into barbarism: but not so. It is, on the contrary, the epoch of the greatest social developments, of the progress of jurisprudence, of the sublimest efforts of the fine arts, and of a general civilising spirit. During the sixteenth century, the work and idea of progress are seen emerging in every direction, and without any fear of retrogression; and assuredly that hope and faith in the future were legitimate. No retrograding tendency was really possible; the whole of Europe was agitated by the sentiment of the equality of all men, introduced by Christianity, and now understood by the serfs and the working classes. The craving for intellectual communications had just received an abundant satisfaction by the discovery of the art of printing; all the accumulated investigations of the Middle Ages were giving an impulse to scientific researches unknown before. Chemistry ensured to the Christian nations a superiority over all others, by the discovery of gunpowder; and Columbus, by his genius and lofty spirit, added a new world to European industry and speculations. The intensity of faith in the progress of civilisation was manifest, in reality, throughout Europe, but the idea of a progress without any possible retrogression is nowhere, to our knowledge, expressed positively before the great Bacon.

The sixteenth century, therefore, is the great crisis that

separates the mediæval period from the modern world. There is no age in history loftier, richer, or more instructive for modern society, than the sixteenth century; it is exuberant with vitality and vigour, whether our attention is fixed on the political or religious history, on the literary movement, or the jurisprudence, or the artistical progress of those eventful times. Many valuable works exist in France, England, and in Germany above all, on some special development of that age, but nothing complete. Let us hope that some of the eminent historians among our cotemporaries will undertake to present in its unity the magnificent tableau of the whole sixteenth century.

The *renaissance*, or revival of letters, is the general appellation given to the return to ancient literature, which characterises the fifteenth century. It became a rooted infatuation. The Greeks and Romans were admired exclusively; the Christian art, the national literature, were left aside with scorn. The path opened with so much felicity by Dante, Boccaccio, and Petrarch, was forsaken. In the sixteenth century, the vernacular spirit of the national literature broke forth, never to be extinguished again. The revival of classical learning had commenced in Italy. Robert, king of Naples, and after him Petrarch and Boccaccio, were the founders of the renovated taste for the ancients. Later, John Malphagino, disciple of Petrarch, and a Greek, Manuel Chrissoloras, taught the classics at Padona, at Florence, and Milan; a crowd of distinguished men followed their steps. The Italian princes, anxious to collect round them a brilliant court of artists and literati, loaded them with favours. Academies, like that of Plato, and learned societies, were founded at Naples, Rome, Florence, and Venice. Manuscripts were eagerly collected; the classical authors were copied and re-copied over and over again. An ardent zeal was manifested for the recovery of the great ancient authors. A host of scholars became celebrated in Italy during the fifteenth century, and among them, more especially, Poggio of Florence. "The first half of the fifteenth century," says Mr. Hallam (*Lit. of Eur.*, ch. ii. § 2), "has

been sometimes called the age of Poggio Bracciolini, which it expresses not very inaccurately as to his literary life, since he was born in 1381, and died in 1459; but it seems to involve too high a compliment. The chief merit of Poggio was his diligence, aided by good fortune, in recovering lost works of Roman literature that lay mouldering in the repositories of convents. Hence we owe to this man eight orations of Cicero, a complete Quintilian, Columella, part of Lucretius, three books of Valerius Flaccus, Silius Italicus, Ammianus Marcellinus, Tertullian, and several less important writers; twelve comedies of Plautus were also recovered in Germany through his directions. Poggio, besides this, was also a man of considerable learning for his time, and still greater sense and spirit as a writer, though he never reached a very correct or elegant style." France, Germany, and England, were far behind Italy in the pursuit of classical literature. The library of Oxford contained only 600 volumes, and there were but four classics in the royal library at Paris. But the dispersion of the Greeks, on the fall of the Eastern empire, diffused a taste for polite literature over all the West of Europe, and the discovery of the art of printing became a prodigious instrument for the dissemination of ideas.

The history of the invention of printing is obscure, and has often been discussed. We will only state, that the art of engraving on wood had long been known, and that the art of printing seems to have been discovered at the same time by Koster (at Harlem), who died towards 1440, and by John Guttenberg. The latter was a noble of Mentz; he established himself at Strasbourg in 1420, occupied himself with his idea of printing, and made his first trials in 1430. On his return to Mentz in 1444, Guttenberg, who associated to himself several rich men, and principally the jeweller, J. Faust, and the ingenious Schœffer, brought his discovery to greater perfection; that of Koster was lost, while Guttenberg, continuing to perfect his own, has been the author of the most stupendous vehicle for the advancement of the modern nations. At the commencement of the sixteenth century, the ardour with

which the literature of the ancients was studied increased considerably. Aldus Manutius, a distinguished scholar, founded at Venice the celebrated printing establishment of the *Aldi*—conducted during more than a century by himself, his son and grandson—and destined to the re-production of the classics. Scholars began carefully to study the texts, to translate them, and edit them with commentaries. The laws and manners of the ancients became also the object of learned researches. All endeavoured to imitate the art, style and manner of the ancients. It was the age of *humanitary* studies. A blind admiration for all that was antique became universal, and merely because of its antiquity. The great men of the Christian civilisation were forgotten: but, on the other hand, it must be confessed that the vernacular literature, the tales, traditions, and manners—in short, the literature of chivalry and chivalry itself—were imbued with a character of coarseness, licentiousness, and imperfection, that estranged the student of a pure and refined taste. Hence that general pursuit of ancient literature that has had such a great influence on modern society.

The greatest advantages that civilisation derived from that general yearning for classical studies were, the instilling a taste for erudition and profound researches, and the elaboration of excellent materials for ancient history. The labours of the multitude of scholars of the sixteenth century are invaluable: Julius Cæsar, Scaliger, or della Scala, Sigonius, Vettori, in Italy—in France, Budeus, Tournebu, Morel, Hotto-man, the Pithous, the Scaligers, Isaac Casaubon, and others—all names celebrated in the history of classical erudition—all instrumental in the great progress as to the knowledge of antiquity. The family of the Stephens', rivals of the Aldi, by their printing establishments, were very superior to them by the services they rendered to science.

But, on the other hand, we may ask the question, whether humanity has not paid too dearly for the results of classical erudition, whatever may be their fairest point of view with regard to the formation of taste and the origin of our modern

languages; for, undoubtedly, that exclusive passion for the ancients clouded, in some degree, the Christian inspiration: it revived those moral and political theories, many of which are both antique and unworthy. The study of the Pagan philosophers often favoured a spirit of scepticism among the superficial, and it inflicted a severe blow on Christian art, as well as on the national literatures, by thus introducing a foreign element and fundamental modifications in the general advancement of Christian civilisation. And, in our time even, do we not see still a superabundance of classical studies, and the exclusion of such subjects as political economy, legislation, and history?

Architecture may be considered as a great book of mankind—so much so, that not only every religious symbol, but every human thought, may be said to have its page in that huge book. During the first period of the Middle Ages, while Europe was organised in a theocratical spirit, a mysterious, austere, straight-lined architecture emerged from the Greek and Roman styles. After the crusades a great popular movement had taken place; for they engendered a spirit of liberty. The municipalities and boroughs vindicated their rights; the face of Europe changed, and architecture also. Then commenced that grand epoch of the Gothic, or, as it should really be called, Catholic architecture.* The people did the work, and plunged into it heart and soul. Their genius and originality, their hopes, sufferings, and yearnings, are all carved on every monument of that period. It was the time of the liberty of architecture, as ours is that of the liberty of the press.

During the fifteenth century, architecture declined. There was a great laxity in the Christian zeal. The church had recourse to strange concessions to obtain the necessary funds. Thus, the beautiful south tower in the front of the cathedral at Rouen was constructed with the money paid by those who wished to obtain the permission of eating butter during Lent;

* See Appendix, No. VIII. (a.)

and it is, at this very day, called *La Tour de Beurre*. Concessions of that kind, for similar purposes, were very usual over the whole of Christendom. With the sixteenth century a new period commenced for architecture. Now many princes and lords raised palaces and halls in which the Gothic style was mixed with the forms of antiquity. There are a great number of them, in England especially. It is the real style of the *renaissance*; the Greek and Roman traces becoming more and more predominant. From the palaces and private houses, the new architecture was adopted for the churches; and, contrary to what had taken place during the period of deep Christian faith, it is now the civil architecture that transforms the religious architecture. On the whole, every expression of vitality and originality had then disappeared in architecture. It may not be improbable that Michael Angelo felt it acutely, and that his great architectural idea was an idea of despair. This Titan in genius piled up the Pantheon over the Parthenon, and created St. Peter of Rome—the last original work in architecture: all that follows is a mere shadow, or a parody of St. Peter.

Painting was also one of the glories of the sixteenth century. Some ancient Byzantine models had kept up, in Italy, a taste for painting. During the thirteenth century, this art, which, until then, had especially served to adorn the churches and manuscripts, became a distinct pursuit. The Byzantine manner was continued, with its rough formal style, and with that imperfection of design that characterises the paintings of the Lower Empire. Afterwards, Giotto became the real founder of the Florentine school (1320). He was followed by many men of genius, who were inspired by the Christian ideal. In the meantime the technical acquirements were increasing. Towards the middle of the fifteenth century, John of Bruges discovered the oil painting. One of his pictures reached Florence, and he soon had a multitude of skilful imitators in Italy, where various schools soon attained an unparalleled degree of splendour, while, in Germany, the art was also advancing rapidly, and attained

a high state of perfection under Albert Durer, at Nuremberg.

The commencement of the sixteenth century is an immortal period in the art of painting—the zenith of that sublime art. Italy had never been adorned by so many men of genius. Raphael, the unparalleled painter; Michael Angelo, the painter, architect, sculptor, engraver, poet—sublime in all; Benvenuto Cellini; Leonardo da Vinci, a painter also, and a scientific genius, who had prophetic gleams of some of our most marvellous modern discoveries, such as the power of steam, for instance; Titian, the Veronese: in literature, the poets Ariosto, Trissino, and Aretino; the historians, Machiavelli, Guicciardini, and others: all were the admiration and envy of Europe. In the meantime, musical art was also advancing, and the taste for it becoming very popular; you can hear still, yearly, in the Sixtina chapel, the inspired strains of Palestrina, and that *Miserere*, the expression of which is in harmony with the *Last Judgment* of Michael Angelo. A glorious epoch! which the visitors of Rome cannot contemplate without emotion, and without experiencing the purifying influence of the fine arts.

We have observed that the national poetry had been declining in Italy. Boccaccio alone had imitators. Light and amusing tales only could amuse the princely society. No poetic cycles roused any longer the native enthusiasm in Germany or in France. With the Ciceronian rhetorical style appeared a new poetry, inspired by Ovid and Virgil; and along with it the mythological images, allegories, and comparisons, drawn from the fables of antiquity. The Gods of Greece found their way even in theology. The sacred songs often became the echoes of Pagan ideas. The Virgin Mary was represented with the characteristics of Venus; madrigals were written on the Christian martyrs; monstrous combination! very expressive of the manners of the times, and of which Rabelais is the representative.

The sixteenth century produced, in the meantime, invaluable labours on jurisprudence, Cujas being, above all, the

most celebrated in that science ; all legal investigators turned more than ever their attention to the Roman law, the local laws being of a secondary importance : and thus, again, the legislations clung to Pagan antiquity, instead of perfecting the institutions that were the offspring of Christianity. The sceptic Montaigne is the most eminent of the moral writers of that age, and characterises it very fairly. Before him Erasmus evinced the most acute philosophical satire. The political works of Machiavelli and Bodinus were justifying the absolute power of kings, and renewed the social ideas of Aristotle and Plato. But the most complete renovation took place in philosophy and in the physical sciences. All the former subtleties were banished ; the natural sciences became a more special pursuit in the numerous universities founded during that age.* Out of the strange confusion of cabalistic theories, of invisible spirits, alchymical operations, and magical arts of the Middle Ages, emerged the first efforts of modern science. Paracelsus, who died in 1541, celebrated for his genius and extravagant adventures, holds a most conspicuous place in this period of the history of science. But a greater man expired two years after him—we mean Copernicus of Thorn, who studied at Cracow, and whose genius was developed at Bologna. The idea of the terrestrial movement flashed through the genius of Copernicus, and after a series of acute observations he effected a complete revolution in science. Many of the corollaries and consequences which he drew from his principles were found, later, to be true, although he did not possess the means necessary to verify them. When he asserted that Venus and Mercury were nearer to the Sun than our Earth, and that, like the earth, they turned round that orb, he was told, But if Mercury and Venus turn round the Sun, and the Earth turns also in a larger circle, we should see Mercury and Venus sometimes full, sometimes in a crescent, like the Moon, and we do not see them so. Nevertheless, it is a fact, replied Copernicus, and it will be found so, if means

* See Appendix, No. VIII. (b.)

are discovered to perfect our sight, or the instruments which assist it. And, in truth, the invention of the telescope and the observations of Galileo proved that he was in the right. Europe—and only the enlightened men in Europe—admitted his sublime observations, and then only as an hypothesis. With the rest of the world Copernicus became the butt of ignoble buffooneries; he became an object of laughter on the stage, as Socrates had been at Athens. The Polish philosopher smiled on all this; but, in the meantime, entreated the Pope to protect his works from the malevolent insinuations of the envious and the ignorant, who, giving their own stupid interpretations to certain passages of the Scriptures, would mutilate the true sense of his books. His prediction was realised. Copernicus foresaw as infallibly the frailty of the human mind, as the regular march of the celestial bodies. More than half a century after the death of this great man, his system, completed by Galileo, was condemned by the Roman inquisition, but received afterwards by Descartes, and all the great philosophers of every age and every country.

The polarity of the magnet, the art of printing, and gunpowder, were the discoveries that prepared the greatness of the sixteenth century, and all the revolutions and movements of modern history. The polarity of the magnet had been known in Europe as early as the thirteenth century, but the compass was not used in sailing till the middle of the fourteenth century; and another century had elapsed from that period, while yet the European mariners scarcely ventured out of the sight of their coasts. In the beginning of the fifteenth century, John I. of Portugal sent a few vessels to explore the African coast, where, in the 29th degree of north latitude, a promontory was termed Cape Non, as forming an impassable limit; these Portuguese vessels doubled the Cape Non. And a single ship of Prince Henry, being driven out to sea, landed on the island of Porto Santo. This experiment emboldened the mariners to abandon their timid mode of coasting, and launch into the open sea. In 1420 the

Portuguese discovered Madeira, where they established a colony, and planted the Cyprus vine and the sugar cane. The Canaries and the Azores were afterwards discovered. Prince Henry having obtained from Pope Eugenius IV. a Bull, granting to the Portuguese the property of all the countries they might discover between Cape Non and India, the spirit of enterprise continued in the ascendant. The Cape Verd islands were discovered and colonised. The Portuguese fleet advanced to the coast of Guinea. Bartholomew Diaz was the first who went to reconnoitre the stormy cape, or Cape of Good Hope. In 1497, Vasco de Gama doubled this tempestuous cape, and arrived on the Malabar coast; he entered into an alliance with the Rajah of Calicut, and returned to Lisbon with specimens of the wealth and produce of the country. A succeeding fleet formed settlements; and, vanquishing the opposition of the native princes, soon achieved the conquest of all the coast of Malabar. The city of Goa, taken by storm, became the residence of a Portuguese viceroy, and the capital of their Indian settlements.

The Venetians had hitherto engrossed the Indian trade. Jealous of the success of the Portuguese, they attempted to intercept them by their fleets stationed at the mouth of the Red Sea and Persian Gulf, but were everywhere encountered by a superior force. The Portuguese made settlements in both the gulfs, and vigorously prosecuted their conquests on the Indian coast and sea. Ceylon, Pegu, Siam, and Malacca, were speedily subdued, and a settlement established in Bengal. They proceeded onward to China, hitherto only known to Europeans by the account of a Venetian traveller, Marco Polo, in the thirteenth century, and they obtained permission to form a settlement at Macao. In the space of fifty years, the Portuguese were masters of the whole trade of the Indian Ocean, and sovereigns of a large extent of Asiatic territory. The commerce of Europe derived immeasurable advantages from these discoveries. Commercial industry was roused in every quarter, and manufactures made a rapid progress. Lyons, Tours, Abbeville, Marseilles, Bordeaux, acquired

immense wealth. Antwerp and Amsterdam became the great marts of the North. Bruges had been ruined by civil commotions, and the Portuguese made Antwerp their entrepôt for the supply of the northern kingdoms; it flourished till the revolt of the Netherlands, when it was taken by the Spaniards, and its port destroyed. But the trade of Holland reached a more diffused extension on the fall of Antwerp, and Amsterdam rose into splendour and high commercial opulence. England felt the effect of that general stimulus which the Portuguese discoveries gave to the trade of Europe, and, blended with the active patriotism of Elizabeth, they became vigorous incentives to national industry.

In the meantime Columbus had discovered a new world. Columbus had one of those lofty souls, generous, energetic, anxious to serve religion and humanity. He had conceived the idea of a world in the West, beyond the vast Atlantic, and he considered it as a glorious duty for a Christian to bring that land under the Christian sway. Whether Columbus had any knowledge of the explorations of the Northmen and Icelandic navigators in America, is of no consequence. M. de Humboldt has analysed, in four learned volumes on the *New Continent*, all that was known of those former explorations and all the traditions. But the verification of such an hypothesis as the existence of a new world, in his time, and with his means, required, on the part of Columbus, an indomitable constancy; and no earthly immortality has ever been more legitimately earned by any mortal than by Columbus. We cannot give an account of his expeditions, of his virtues and misfortunes. They will be found exquisitely sketched by Mr. Washington Irving, in his *Life of Columbus*. The Spaniards fell on America like birds of prey. While the Portuguese were forming commercial establishments in the new colonies, the Spaniards thirsted for nothing but gold; they believed the newly-discovered countries to contain inexhaustible treasures, and, under the pretence of religion and policy, they conducted themselves with infamous atrocity. The rack, the scourge, the faggot, were employed to convert the

poor Indians to Christianity. They were hunted down like wild beasts, or burnt alive. St. Domingo, containing 3,000,000 of inhabitants, and Cuba, containing above 600,000, were, in a few years, absolutely depopulated. It was resolved afterwards to explore the new continent, and to establish the Spanish domination over America.

Columbus had landed in America towards the close of the fifteenth century. Fernando Cortez sailed from Cuba in 1519, landed at Tabasco, and approached the capital of the splendid Mexican empire. The Mexicans, on finding in the Spaniards nothing beyond what was human, became daring enough to attack them. The intrepid Cortez marched immediately to the palace, and putting the emperor in irons, the Mexicans submitted. Velasquez, governor of Cuba, jealous of Cortez, attempted to supersede him, by dispatching a superior army to the Continent; but the latter defeating his troops, compelled them to join his own banners. Soon after, the whole Mexican empire armed against the Spaniards. Cortez exterminated the multitude. All the princes of the royal blood were put to death, and he remained absolute master of the whole empire, in 1521. The conquest of Peru was still more easy. Pizarro and d'Almagro, with a handful of Spaniards, landed in that large and flourishing empire. The monarch, or Inca, received the Spaniards with reverence, but they immediately required him to embrace the Christian faith, and during a peaceful interview, the Spaniards commenced a general massacre of the natives. The empire was now plundered of prodigious treasures in gold and precious stones, and completely subdued. D'Almagro marched 500 leagues, through continual opposition, and penetrated across the Cordilleras into Chili. But after the victory the conquerors divided. D'Almagro was slain in the civil war, and Pizarro soon after assassinated by the party of his rival. It was only several years after, that order was finally restored in South America by the governor sent from the central government of Spain. The conquests of Mexico and Peru have been admirably related by an accomplished American, Mr. Prescott.

Such was the origin of the colonial system of the nations of Europe. The example of the Spaniards excited a desire in the other nations of Europe to participate with them in the riches of the New World. The French made several attempts to form settlements. They more especially established themselves in Canada, and founded Quebec, but the colony was perpetually subject to attacks from the English; they afterwards drew their greatest advantages from St. Domingo, Guadaloupe, and Martinico. The Dutch formed several settlements in Guiana, in the West Indies. New York and Pennsylvania were in their possession till they were conquered by the English. The extensive settlements of the British on the continent of America and the West Indian Islands are well known: the energetic activity and industry of the Anglo-Saxon race have rendered them a vast profitable market for home manufactures, and most fertile in products, invaluable to the manufactures and commerce of England.

Let us resume our political sketches of Europe. A new era, we have said, commenced with the sixteenth century, and along with it a general conflict of nations, stimulated exclusively by royal ambition. Maximilian, elected emperor, by establishing a perpetual peace between the separate Germanic states, laid the foundation of the grandeur of the empire. Spain was strengthening her political and religious unity, and the Spaniards, animated by their devotedness to their old maxims and tenets, began to hold a conspicuous place in the system of Central Europe. Ferdinand and Isabella both possessed the genius of government, and were the founders of the greatness of Spain. The Peninsula was then a prey to the lawless depredations of the nobles.

The Inquisition came to assist the Crown in the extension of the royal authority. Every city had its franchises, every grandee his privileges. Those obstacles were to be subdued before any conquest could be undertaken. The Spanish crown spent thirty years of perseverance and efforts before it accomplished the desired object. In 1492 Ferdinand and Isabella forced the Moors to open the gates of their beloved Grenada after a

siege of nine months, but with the promise of the free exercise of their religion and the selection of their own judges. After the conquest of Grenada, the Inquisition commenced a fearful system of persecution. All the Jews were ordered to become Christians, or to leave Spain within four months, without taking any gold or silver. 170,000 families fled from the country; most of them perished wretchedly in Italy or Portugal. The Moors were afterwards persecuted with equal cruelty, despite the royal pledge. The greatness and unity of Spain were purchased with abominable iniquities. But Isabella had no share in the inhuman and crafty political measures of this reign, while the largest portion of glory of this epoch belongs to her. Her fair figure, blending tenderness with genius, energy, and undaunted fortitude, is the glory of her sex. She saw with deep regret the establishment of the Inquisition; in spite of Ferdinand, she armed the ships destined to discover America; she defended Columbus when he was accused; she consoled Gonzalvo di Cordova in his disgrace; she ordered the enfranchisement of the unfortunate Americans. She was accomplished, and understood Latin, while her husband could scarcely sign his own name; in her youth she had evinced the greatest courage, and in one instance when Ferdinand fled she scorned to imitate him. Isabella was adored by the Castellans; she protected their independence, and, at her death (1504), her mission was continued by her virtuous counsellor and friend, the celebrated Ximenes, archbishop of Toledo, who in the midst of courtly pomp and luxuries continued to adhere to the austere privations and regulations of the order of St. Francis. Philip of Austria, the son-in-law of Ferdinand and Isabella, died also in 1506, and Ferdinand was able to govern Castille with the assistance of Ximenes, whom, on his death-bed in 1516, he left regent till the arrival of his grandson, Charles of Austria. Charles arrived surrounded by his Flemish, who became odious to the Spaniards: he ruffled the Castilian pride by several imprudent and illegal measures, and started to take possession of the imperial crown, leaving behind him the germs of

a furious revolution. The whole of Spain was soon in a state of revolt. Charles V. had the good fortune to suppress it, and to recover his ascendancy ; but he had seen enough of Spain to respect the Spanish pride ; and as he felt that he possessed in this heroic nation a valuable instrument for his ambitious views, he ever afterwards affected for the Spaniards a great esteem and sympathy.

We have spoken of the condition of Italy. This Peninsula was a compound of various rival states, each straining after an extension of territory whilst reprobating the very same views in their neighbours. Since Sixtus IV. the Pontiffs had totally forgotten their religious position ; their temporal interests alone occupied them. Alexander VI., the personification of all the opprobrium of the Roman court, continued the same system while plunged with his race in a pool of infernal crimes and debaucheries. The princes of Arragon were reigning at Naples, but the house of France had inherited the claims of the house of Anjou. We have mentioned the expedition of Charles VIII. of France in the Milanese, where he was called by Louis the Moor, and afterwards at Naples, and his death (1498).

France, situated between Germany and Spain, seemed destined to counterbalance the tremendous power of the house of Austria ; her efforts and the reformation saved perhaps Europe from the realisation of a universal monarchy. Before the commencement of this mighty struggle between mighty ambitions, Italy was to be again the cause and theatre of a conflict. Charles VIII. was succeeded by his nearest relation, Louis XII., who diminished the taxes, notwithstanding his wars, and deserved the appellation of father of the people. Louis added to the royal claims over Naples, pretensions over the Milanese as grandson of Valentine Visconti. He passed the Alps, took possession of the Milanese, then treated with Ferdinand of Arragon for the common conquest and division of the kingdom of Naples, and French and Spaniards became masters of it. They soon disagreed on questions of limits, the levying of taxes, and flew to arms. Ferdinand gained

time by perfidious negotiations, and his army, admirably disciplined, and admirably commanded by the *great captain*, Gonzalvo di Cordova, triumphed over the brilliant but more disorderly courage of the French. The exploits of Bayard were of no avail. The French, after being defeated at Cerignola and Garigliano, were driven away from Naples.

The eternal jealousy of monarchies against republics, of poor nations against opulent industry, became a bond of union between most of the rival princes of the West. The government of Venice alone had derived great advantages from the faults and misfortunes of all the other powers, and thus excited the fear and jealousy of all. The kings who hoped for a share in the wealth and territory of the opulent Venice, formed a league (the league of Cambrai, 1508), composed of the Pope, France, Germany, and Spain. The Pope Julius II., both a politician and general, remarkable for his energy and acuteness, had no other object in view but the grandeur of the pontifical state; he wished to recover a few cities in Romagna. The French and Germans attacked Venice. The city of St. Marc resisted with courage the impending storm. Her ruin, however, seemed inevitable. But as soon as the Pope, and after him the king of Naples, had obtained the object of their wishes, they abandoned the league, succeeded in having it dissolved, and re-organised it immediately after against France. Louis XII. found himself alone, without allies, exposed to a formidable coalition, whose ardent object was the expulsion of the French from Italy. A long resistance was impossible; nevertheless the French army committed unjustifiable cruelties, at Brescia for instance. The bloody victory of Ravenna was of no utility to them (1512). France was attacked in all directions; her armies were defeated at Navarra by the Swiss, at Guinegate by the English (day of spurs). They evacuated Italy. Sforza was restored at Milan; Ferdinand conquered Navarre. Peace was signed after various treaties, and old Louis XII. married the young sister of Henry VIII. (1514.)

In 1515 Francis I. ascended the throne of France; worthy

cotemporary of Charles V. and Leo X. He naturalised in France the letters and arts of Italy ; but being void of morality, and especially of political genius, he forms a singular contrast with his great rival, the statesman Charles V. Francis is more a hero of the Middle Ages than a sovereign of the sixteenth century. Whilst Europe thought France exhausted, she suddenly displayed new resources and an unexpected vigour. Her young king, on the very first year of his reign, advanced in the Alps with a brilliant army, threatening the Milanese ; he met the Swiss at Marignano, and gained a sanguinary victory, immediately after which he signed with the Swiss the treaty of Noyon, and seemed to prepare for the great events that followed.

In 1519 Francis I. was a candidate for the imperial crown of Germany. The electors felt that Charles V. would be the most capable of defending them against the Turks, and they selected him ; then commenced the implacable rivalry between these two monarchs. Both professed equal rights over Naples, Milan, and Burgundy ; their resources were equally great ; those of Charles more extensive, but scattered ; those of Francis more compact and united. The war soon broke out. The French armies being defeated in Lombardy, were obliged to leave Italy (1521). The king of France was preparing to re-enter Italy when an injustice deprived him of one of his best generals, the constable of Bourbon, who passed into the ranks of the enemy, and entered the south of France without success ; the French army in the meantime crossed the Alps, and was on the point of recovering Lombardy, when the obstinacy and heedlessness of Francis I. made him lose all his hopes at the disaster of Pavia, where he was taken prisoner and conducted to Madrid (1525).

The emperor derived no great advantage from his good fortune. After a year's captivity, Francis I. regained his liberty by the humiliating treaty of Madrid, yielding to Charles the duchy of Burgundy, and renouncing his pretensions over Italy. He gave his two sons as hostages for the fulfilment of these conditions ; but the states refused to ratify

them ; the king himself protested against the violence that had extorted such conditions from him. The former allies of the emperor, the Pope, Venice, Milan, the king of England, alarmed at the victories of the emperor, gave their support to the pretensions of France. Charles, by skilful negotiations, dispelled the threatening storm ; he seized afterwards the opportunity offered by the inactivity of his enemies to exercise an awful vengeance on the Pope. Rome was assailed by his mercenary army thirsting for plunder (1527), taken by storm and plundered by a Christian army, in the name of a Christian emperor, with a rapacious cruelty by far surpassing the ravages of the Goths and Vandals : about 8,000 Romans were massacred on the first day ; nothing was spared ; churches and convents were equally sullied and plundered. The Spaniards inflicted the most cruel tortures on the victims to make them give up their gold. During about fifty days nothing could be heard but the shrieks that came from every house. The Pope, kept prisoner, only obtained his liberty by paying a high ransom. Europe was indignant, and Francis I. thought the moment favourable to renew hostilities. In 1528 a French army and fleet besieged Naples : but the plague began to decimate the French troops, while the Genoese Admiral, Doria, in the service of France, finding that Francis I. did not keep his engagements with him, nor respected the privileges of Genoa, embraced the cause of the emperor of Germany, defeated the French, and restored to Genoa her former republican constitution. On the following year (1529) Charles, alarmed by the progress of the Reformation and the invasions of the terrible Solyman (Suleiman), was wishing secretly for peace. The king of France was exhausted ; all he desired was to recover his children and keep Burgundy ; and, regardless of the interests and fate of his allies, he signed the treaty of Cambrai, by which he left Florence and Venice at the mercy of the vindictive emperor. This odious and dishonourable treaty banished for ever the French from Italy.

A peace of seven years between the Christian nations of

Europe gave Charles V. time to attend to other interests. The Turks had invaded Hungary and advanced as far as Vienna. Ferdinand, the emperor's brother, and the emperor in person, forced them to retreat; nevertheless, the war was long protracted. In the meantime Charles V. undertook his most glorious expedition. The knights of St. John of Jerusalem had lost Rhodes after an heroic resistance; the emperor had given them Malta, where they were harrassed by the innumerable vessels of Hayradin Barbarossa, Dey of Tunis, and admiral of Solymán. His pirates were the scourge of the Mediterranean sea. Charles started for Africa with 500 vessels, and landed with 30,000 men. Goletta was taken by storm. Tunis surrendered, and 20,000 Christians, delivered from slavery, returned to Europe, pouring out their loud blessings on the name of Charles V. (1535.)

The conduct of the king of France was presenting a sad contrast. He contracted an alliance with Solymán, and the crescent was seen afterwards allied with the fleur-de-lys; he was negotiating with Henry VIII. of England, and with the Protestants of Germany, while he had those of France burnt in his presence at Paris. He could not inspire any confidence to any party. He took advantage of the difficulties and expeditions of his rival to re-commence the war. The French suddenly invaded Savoy and Piedmont; but they were defeated. The imperial army entered Provence, Champagne, Picardy, and met nothing but ruin, smoke, and ashes. The French had made a desert to oppose and defeat the invaders. The imperialists soon retreated, and a truce of ten years was concluded at Nice (1538).

A second expedition of Charles V. in Africa proved most disastrous (1541-42). His army experienced a bloody defeat near Algiers; the elements seemed to conspire against him; a tempest destroyed his fleet. Francis I. immediately renewed the war with animosity; the emperor had refused him the investiture of Milan for his second son, the duke of Orleans, which he had promised when, on his way to Ghent, after the truce of Nice, he received in Paris the magnificent

hospitality of the French king. In Italy the French were victorious in the battle of Cerizoles, but derived no benefit from this advantage. The French and Turkish fleets were dispersed by the great Admiral Doria. France was menaced again on all sides, and displayed an unexpected vigour. Henry VIII. of England, the emperor's ally, invaded Picardy, while Charles was entering Champagne. France was saved by the energetic resistance of the popular masses. The emperor hearing of the new progress of the Turks in Hungary, signed with Francis the peace of Crespy 1544, by which the king of France renounced all claims upon Naples, and Charles on Burgundy. Some time after, Francis I. and Henry VIII. concluded also a peace, and both died in the same year (1547). The English kept Boulogne.

The same struggle was terminated by other actors. After the death of Francis I., his son, Henry II., encouraged by the success of the Protestants, seized upon three bishoprics, Metz, Toul, and Verdun. Charles again had recourse to arms; but Francis of Guise successfully defended Metz and defeated the Spaniards. The emperor found that cares and difficulties increased as he advanced in life; the vigour of his mind was shattered: desponding, and forsaken by fortune, he abdicated, and retired from the world to the convent of St. Just (1556). His vast dominions were divided. His son Philip II. inherited Spain and the Netherlands, the Two Sicilies and Milan. His brother Ferdinand obtained the Austrian possessions, to which he added the imperial crown. Philip II. at the commencement of his reign was hoping for the glorious days of Charles V. France and the Pope, jealous of his power, endeavoured to deprive him of Milan and the Sicilies, but, with the aid of the English, he defeated the French at St. Quentin, in Picardy; in honour of which victory he built his gloomy and massive palace of the Escorial. But the duke of Guise revived the spirit of the French by the capture of Calais from the English, which they had now possessed for two hundred years. Another great victory, however, obtained by Philip near Gravelines, led to the treaty of Cateau Cam-

bresis in 1559, by which the French surrendered to Spain no less than eighty-nine fortified towns in the Low Countries and in Italy.

Francis I. extended considerably the royal authority; he used to boast of having placed the kings for the future out of all control (*hors de pages*). He concentrated in his own hands the ecclesiastical authority; he limited the ecclesiastical jurisdictions; he organised a system of police, and forced the parliaments not to interfere with political questions. Nevertheless, the general agitation and activity of the public mind was continuing to increase; and we shall see that the spirit of liberty, blended with religion, often took the latter as a veil, to re-appear openly on a future day with greater vigour, and penetrate deeper and deeper into the political institutions. Francis was the first of the French kings who commenced that extravagant system of expenditure and a system of augmenting the impost in order to supply their own pleasures and capricious wars. Louis XI. had raised five millions of francs of taxes: Louis XII. for a time diminished them; and Francis made them amount to nine millions; he sold the public offices, disposed of some of the royal domains; instituted the first perpetual dividends, and founded the royal lottery, restored afterwards by Louis XIV. Since 1484 the kings had not convoked the states-general for their financial measures. They substituted for them assemblies of *notables*, and generally raised the money by royal decrees or orders, which they merely had registered by the parliament of Paris.

Spain was gradually advancing towards the system of absolutism of the French crown. Charles V. passed many laws without the authority of the cortes. In 1538, the nobles and prelates of Castille having rejected the general impost of the *sisá*, which was to be on the retailing of all goods and provisions, the king of Spain ceased to convoke them; afterwards the cortes only consisted of thirty-six deputies, sent by the only eighteen cities that were represented. The nobles repented too late having assisted the king in crushing the *comuneros* in 1521. Moreover, the awful power of the Inqui-

sition was making rapid progress ; it was introduced in the Netherlands in 1522. The tribunals of the Inquisition obtained the right of exercising the royal jurisdiction—a worthy instrument of a cruel despotism ! Philip II. completed the triumph of tyranny ; even the ancient privileges of Arragon were trampled under foot.

In an economical point of view, the reign of Charles V. was most fatal to Europe. He, above all, in consideration of his vast capacity, deserves the reprobation of posterity ;—he violently forced Europe to turn away from the legitimate and regular means of production, in order to plunge into the hazards of warfare, and in the old system of iniquitous extortion engendered by feudalism ;—he was the author of false doctrines and fatal prejudices, which were continued after him, and improved upon, by his execrable successor—and this at an epoch when the development of intelligence and activity, when the wonderful means of action discovered, would have promoted the advancement of Christian civilisation in a surpassing degree, had they received the direction intended by Providence. Humanity has also to stigmatise Charles V. for having restored, on an enormous scale, slavery, that had been banished from Christian nations. Under his reign, the slave-trade was organised as a regular and legitimate institution, and the old fatal doctrine of the ancients was renewed, in virtue of which the profits of social labour belong to a few privileged beings. Millions of men have perished in America, victims of this accursed prejudice ; and after three hundred years Africa has not yet ceased paying her tribute of tears and blood to the system it has engendered. Nothing can be more outrageous and absurd than the privileges invented then. The colonies were exposed to abuses, to atrocious persecutions, which would seem incredible and fabulous in our time. The whole spirit and nature of the Spanish civilisation was represented by the whip of the chief. The treasures of the New World exercised also a fatal influence on industry and labour. The Spaniards in possession of the mines of Peru soon scorned all agricultural pursuits ; every Spanish gentleman thought himself en-

titled to a fief in the New World, and the colonial legislation confirmed this fatal prejudice. America was considered as the national property of the metropolis, and it received regulations, the stupid tyranny of which has been equally fatal to both. Then commenced in modern history the system of political economy that has so long prevailed in Europe, and prepared those monopolies and rivalries of commerce and industry which are just beginning to be understood as being anti-progressive, as well as a deadly obstacle to the prosperity of a nation.

Let us now turn to the history of ideas.

The sixteenth century was the age of the revolt of intelligence; it prepared the decline of all ancient powers, and it commenced by the church. Unknown voices began to be heard proposing to refuse members of the Church the right of making a traffic of heaven and hell. Such was the commencement of the revolution that shook Europe in its foundation, and the consequences of which are still visible in every nation of Europe. The subject of the Reformation, it is well known, has been unfortunately obscured by prejudices, passions, dishonesty, and disregard of history; and, however brief may be our observations on the subject, they are the result of earnest researches after truth, intended to be wholly divested of any latent bias.

The worldly and voluptuous tastes, the splendid projects, of Pope Leo X., demanded large supplies of money; the Papal See had never been more necessitous. He had recourse to the public sale of indulgences to replenish his empty coffers, and his unscrupulous agents proceeded from place to place, reaping an ample harvest from popular credulity. But every good and patriotic man joined in reprobating such abuses. The Augustin friars, above all, were disgusted with the profanation; and one of them, Martin Luther, began to attack the sale of indulgences, and thus to hasten the reformation which had for ages been demanded. Of a rash and fiery temperament, Luther scorned the threats of all the intemperate and interested zealots; he drew up ninety-five propositions, which

he launched at the abuse, its authors, disseminators, and favourers. It is, however, certain that he had no intention of separating from the Roman Catholic church; nothing can exceed the humility of his letters to Leo during his controversy with the disseminators of indulgences. The Pope was inattentive to what he called a mere squabble among friars; but he was roused from his lethargy by the remonstrances of his advisers. Luther, from indulgences, now passed to doctrines, by assailing free-will and the ordinary means of justification. The Papal legate, hearing of the new propositions, declared him a heretic, and summoned him to appear before his tribunal at Augsburg. Luther repaired to Augsburg, the place appointed for the assembly of a diet, in October 1518. Here endless disputations took place; the novel doctrines of Luther regarding justification by faith and the predestination of the elect were regarded with contempt; he was repeatedly urged to retract them. In the end, however, driven to an extremity—and fearful, perhaps, that his safe-conduct would prove of as little avail as that of Huss had proved—he secretly fled from the city, leaving in the hands of a notary an appeal to the Pope, which was an unmanly evasion, for it is well known and proved that he was then resolved to disregard the Papal decision, if unfavourable to his cause. Afterwards, Luther continued to denounce from the pulpit both his opponents and the authority of Leo; and though he had promised the archbishop elector of Treves to refrain in future from hostility to the Pope, neither his pen nor his tongue ceased to be active. He also appeared publicly to defend Carlstadt, one of his disciples; and the polemics repaired to Leipsic in June 1519.

The conference at Leipsic was imposing; two dukes and a multitude of doctors and magistrates were present, but no benefit could be expected from it. The nature and means of justification—the superiority of the Roman See—the question of purgatory—the nature of indulgences—absolution, grace, free-will—were all discussed, and all that remained were mere words. In the meantime, Luther composed some of his most offensive works, in which he indulges in a tone so coarse,

that it would not be tolerated in the lowest publication of the day. This period in Luther's life is marked by a great inconsistency ; his alternate violence and dissimulation had taught a great part of mankind to distrust his motives. Even his adherents did not then place any reliance on him. Finally, as the audacity of Luther and his insulting sarcasms addressed to the Pope were such that they could no longer be overlooked, a congregation of cardinals was assembled, and the Bull of condemnation drawn up, sanctioned and published ; sixty days were allowed him for his retractation, and he was declared ex-communicate if, after that time, he was still obstinate. The resolution of Luther rose with the occasion ; he could rely also on the frequent pledges of support which he had received from some of the German nobles. He burnt publicly at Wittenberg the Papal Bull, and the controversial writings of his opponents ; he did not refrain from expressing his regret that he was unable to inflict the same fate on Leo himself.

The instances of the Papal agents to procure from Charles V. the condemnation of Luther were vain. The elector of Saxony and several powerful princes insisted that the reformer should not be judged unheard ; he therefore received a safe-conduct, guaranteeing his security to appear at the diet of Worms (April 1521). Luther did not hesitate to obey the citation : he reached Worms ; and the proceedings of this diet form the most memorable period in his life : it is here that he may be said to have laid the foundation of Protestantism. With a remarkable intrepidity of character, Luther refused to submit his writings before any earthly tribunal, or to retract a single proposition, unless shown to be erroneous by the authority of Scripture. Being commanded to leave Worms, he left it ; on his way back, entering a forest, his carriage was suddenly stopped by a party of armed horsemen in masks, who took him to the solitary castle of Wartburg, near Eisenach. All this was done secretly, and it was promulgated that his enemies had carried him away—while, on the contrary, he was under the protection of the elector of Saxony. A month after his departure, by an imperial edict, he was placed under the

ban of the empire, and was to be seized wherever he might be ; but the edict could not be enforced. From Wartburg—from this Patmos, as he called the place of his retreat—Luther soon convinced the world that he was alive, by the furious treatises which he published against his opponents ; probably the unusual seclusion to which he was now subjected soured a temper naturally violent. His most conspicuous writings during this period were against the Papal authority—auricular confession—monastic vows—clerical celibacy—private masses ;—they had a wonderful effect on the public mind ; they engendered many extravagancies, heresies in doctrine, and anarchy in discipline. Luther, who perceived that his Reformation was on the brink of ruin, resolved to return, and he left the castle of Wartburg without so much as intimating his purpose. He arrived at Wittenberg, where, ascending the pulpit, he declaimed furiously against the abuses of his followers, and, above all, his friend Carlstadt, who had indulged in many reforms on his own authority. It has been asserted by Protestant historians that the real cause of this reproof on the part of Luther was jealousy, lest any of his disciples should presume to encroach on an authority which he represented as divine. Nevertheless, Carlstadt resolved to act a separate part. In this view, he opposed the favourite tenet of Luther on the real presence, contending that, after consecration, nothing but bread and wine remained ; that Christ was not present in the sacrament, which was merely a rite instituted to perpetuate the remembrance of our Saviour's last supper. But such was the hostility he encountered from Luther, that he was compelled to leave Wittenberg ;—he afterwards excited still more Luther's indignation by calling him a vain and sensual man, a flatterer of princes, and something, too, of an idolater, since he retained the real presence and a service very similar to the mass. They remained mortal enemies.

The influence of Luther over the populace and the inferior nobles was now unbounded. Any open violence to him was impossible ; and he greatly extended that influence by publishing in the vernacular tongue a version of the Scriptures,

being assisted by Melancthon and other scholars. The translation of Luther, however beautiful and elegant, did great harm to his cause. From perusing the Scriptures, many of his partisans began to perceive a meaning different from that which *he* had established as the only true one. Hence the number of sects into which the Reformers were soon divided, and among them, especially, the tenets of Zwingli of Zurich, who denied original sin, and the efficacy of baptism, and the real presence. Luther denounced him as the offspring of the devil, called him a Pagan, a blasphemer, a liar, and an ass. All was in vain—another church rose by the side of his own.

But the sect which caused most irritation to Luther was that of the Anabaptists, who were certainly his offspring, although he execrated them. One of his partisans, Stork, assumed the tenet of the reformers, that the sacraments had no inherent virtue, and drew the inference that the baptism of infants was useless, and hence the necessity of re-baptising those who were arrived at years of reason. To this reasoning were added doctrines of independence, of equality, and of justice; they were naturally exceedingly agreeable to the peasantry, who were ground to the earth by feudal exactions and by the tyranny of the noble and the rich. The sect increased prodigiously. Little is heard of Stork, who soon disappeared, but the fanatic hero of this war of peasants (*Bauernkrieg*) is Thomas Munzer. Calumny and ignorance have confounded him with the Anabaptists of Munster. Munzer displayed early, both genius and energy; Melancthon, who held him in aversion, speaks of his acquirements and learning. At the age of twenty-two (in 1520), he was appointed preacher in Thuringia, and there for the first time broke openly with Luther, whose Reformation he declared to be insufficient. Thuringia, being near Bohemia, had preserved some remains of the doctrine of the Hussites; Munzer, by his sermons, revived those sparks; his ambition, ardour, and activity, favoured the Anabaptists, who now formed themselves publicly into a body. His principles were, that political reforms were inseparable from any religious progress;—he proclaimed the

right of the whole of humanity to happiness, the complete equality of all before the law, and protested against the existence of a nobility and clerical hierarchy. His popularity soon became alarming. Luther and Melancthon assailed him with a furious vehemence, which only increased the audacity of Munzer, who, persecuted and tracked, put himself at the head of the peasants; but these peasants, breaking suddenly their chains, were callous and deaf to the doctrine of Munzer, who thus became responsible for their crimes and ravages. It was a German *Jacquerie*. The Suabian confederacy sent an army against the peasants, and a merciless war commenced. At the commencement of the war, the peasants positively evinced some reluctance to cruelty, but the cold-blooded, implacable vengeance of the feudal nobles drove them to despair; they became furious; and Suabia, Thuringia, and Franconia, the theatre of the war of the peasants, beheld scenes of ferocity and of destruction that have never been surpassed.

The armed peasants amounted once to about 120,000, and had their discipline borne any proportion to their numerical strength, the gentlemen and clergy of Germany might have trembled; but the insurgents had no common will, and were not actuated by the same motives—and the career thus prosecuted soon became so dreadful, that princes, Catholic and Protestant, hastened to extinguish a flame which must, unchecked, consume both them and their country. In a few weeks, 50,000 of the misguided creatures were massacred. Such tumultuous forces could not oppose much resistance to the warlike and disciplined chivalry of Germany. In the meantime, Munzer, triumphant at Mulhausen, established a *Christian republic* (1525), where, during his short reign, he lived with simplicity, and conducted himself with moderation. Melancthon committed himself when he wrote to Luther that Munzer reigned at Mulhausen, during one whole year, like a dissolute prince. He could easily have ascertained that Munzer only remained two months at Mulhausen, as proved by the historian Zimmermann, after which he left that city, at the head of a horde, to oppose the princes and citizens who,

at the voice of Luther, marched to exterminate the impious rebels. Munzer felt that the ruin of himself and of the popular cause was at hand : he became frantic, delirious. He encamped on a hill, near Frankenhauseu ; forced his followers to reject all offers of peace from the princes, who surrounded him with a powerful artillery, and about 12,000 men of regular troops. The action commenced : the rebels were levelled to the ground as easily as a flock of sheep, and the rest fled : 5,000 were stretched on the field. Munzer was taken : he sustained insult, torture, and death, with an indomitable courage. His wife, in a state of pregnancy, was found at Mulhausen, dragged in the streets, exposed to the outrage of a barbarous soldiery, in presence of the princes. She asked for a weapon, to die ; in reply, a soldier ravished her in presence of the whole army : when she was raised, she was dead.

Munzer has generally been called, by the French and English historians, a great impostor, because the authentic documents and details of his life and times were not sufficiently known. There is not an enlightened German, we believe, in our time, who is not aware that Munzer was a man of a lofty heart and soul, perhaps too much in advance of his times ; that his too ardent imagination did not understand the real state of the people, then in infancy, and led him, also, to deplorable excesses ; but that some of his ideas and social principles are, at this very time, hailed with enthusiasm by the Germanic nations.

The remaining hordes of peasants were afterwards tracked and exterminated. The duke of Guise came from Lorraine to Alsacy, with an army of 30,000 men, and enjoyed a regular butchery of them, on a large scale. The Anabaptists, thus humbled and defeated, a considerable number of them resorted to Switzerland and the Low Countries, especially to Holland, where they increased their numbers, and plunged into the wildest fanaticism. Some did not hesitate to assert, that it was their duty to exterminate all who refused to enter their communion ; that there was no matrimonial bond, and that

every man might have as many wives as he pleased. These madmen roused the local authorities, in several cities, and some were beheaded or banished; but in 1533 Munster, in Westphalia, became the stronghold of the sect, or the capital of their divine kingdom. They expelled the authorities. John Beccald, a tailor of Leyden, became the king of those profligate wretches, and this burlesque of royalty contrived, during a full year, to maintain his authority in the midst of the most incredible debaucheries. A league of princes, both Catholics and Protestants, attacked Munster. The inhabitants were decimated by famine and disease; nevertheless, when the besiegers entered the city, a general carnage took place: no pity shown to tottering age, or helpless infancy. No cruelty could be more demoniacal than that of the victors, and they were sanctioned by Christian bishops and others. Their names ought to be held in execration so long as there are records among men.

Let us revert to Luther. His spiritual empire was rapidly extending. Most of the German princes were naturally led by the advantages they derived in forsaking the Roman Catholic for the Lutheran faith: the prospect of dividing among themselves the rich domains of the church, must have operated powerfully on men burthened with debts, and not much distinguished for religious zeal. The Pope and the emperor made every effort to resist the progress of the Reformation; and despairing of any good resolution from a general diet, the Catholic princes formed a league in defence of their religion. The Lutherans were not without alarm. In self-defence, they formed at Turgau (1526) a centre league: but had the reformers been united among themselves, they would have been more than a match for the Roman Catholics. The divisions between the Lutherans and Zwinglians were continual; both parties branding each other with the most opprobrious epithets.

The more moderate of the two parties, Catholics and Reformers, made efforts to prevent an open rupture, and agreed to send deputies, to act in common, in the approaching diet

of Spires. It was opened in March 1529. The Lutherans refused to sanction the decree of the diet, and the reformed princes and deputies remonstrated; they delivered a formal *protestation* against it—hence their celebrated denomination of PROTESTANTS, dated from the diet of Spires, April 19th, 1529. With regard to the denomination of *Huguenot*, we find its origin variously accounted for. Theod. Beza (*Hist. Eccles.*) states that France, driven violently to the conquest of the enfranchisement of thought, long retained mixed with it the superstitions of the Middle Ages; that, in many cities, the people believed in the nightly visits of mysterious and formidable spirits. Their dark monarch dwelt at Tours, and was called Huguet; and, as the Calvinists held sometimes nightly meetings, after the conjuration of Amboise, their enemies called them Huguenots, intending to give them an ignominious appellation. On the other hand, Pluquet, Fleury, and others, affirm that this denomination given to the Calvinists is derived from the German word meaning confederates (*eidgenossen*)—or, bound by oath.

During the year that followed the diet of Spires, the emperor convoked another at Augsburg, with the view of forcing the two parties to peace. This diet is celebrated for the first confessions of faith presented to the world by the Protestants as a body. An interminable theological controversy was the only result of the diet of Augsburg—and seeing that there was no hope of an agreement, the emperor and the Catholic princes drew up the decree of Augsburg, which was intended to effect by force what conciliation had attempted in vain. The heads of the Lutherans met at Schmalkalden, and formed themselves into a league for the defence of their persons and religion. Such a union was necessary; for Charles had thrown himself into the arms of the Catholics, and was waiting the course of events, perhaps to fall on them, certainly to weaken them, by force or intrigues; but the progress of the Turks in Hungary no doubt deterred him from his projects. In the meantime, the negotiations between the Lutherans and the Catholics were several times resumed and suspended, and at

length a peace was concluded at Nuremberg (1532). During the next few years there was no open hostility between the two religious parties, though both regarded each other with abhorrence. The jealousy of both was so sensitive, the agitation of the public mind so feverish, that the attempts to conclude a durable peace were frequent but fruitless. The Catholic princes formed, also, a league, to defend their subjects against the perpetual encroachments of the reformers, who were emboldened by the daily augmentation of their league of Schmalkalden. In 1540, Worms became again the scene of a conference, where again there was an interminable theological disputation, from which no good resulted. Other colloquies and conferences followed during the subsequent years, exhibiting, on both sides, the same jealousy, the same duplicity, often the same violence, when the mask was no longer required. At last, in 1546, both parties took the field. The emperor had seduced some of the leaders of the Protestants, above all, Maurice, duke of Saxony, who was jealous of John Frederic, chief of the electoral branch of Saxony, and also the two margraves of Brandenburg.

This war of Schmalkalden was terminated in a single campaign. Charles V. dissipated the armies of the confederates, greatly superior in number, and took every city which he summoned, most of them being pardoned on two conditions—the renunciation of the Schmalkalden league, and a heavy fine. Notwithstanding this disastrous campaign, there was still hope for the reformers. The elector of Saxony, aided by his allies, still resisted bravely; he obtained a signal victory over a general of Charles, but the emperor opened rapidly a second campaign, entered Saxony, pursued the elector, defeated him at the battle of Muhlberg (1547), took him prisoner, and had the unmanliness to insult his fallen foe: in his rage he violated the constitutional forms of the empire by condemning his captive to death without being publicly tried by his equals, but the remonstrances of his allies saved him from this disgraceful extremity. The electoral dignity was conferred on Maurice. The landgrave, father-in-law of Maurice,

made also his submission, being assured that his life, liberty, dignity, and wealth, should be respected. But he no sooner was in the emperor's hands than he was committed to prison. This disgraceful violation of his word deeply offended the new elector Maurice, and explains his subsequent defection. The proceedings of Charles V. at this period prove most unequivocally that he had resolved to extirpate the new religion, and to erect an imperial despotism on the ruins of Germanic liberty. At heart he was a despot. He effected, however, several improvements in the internal administration; he restored the imperial chamber; but in his eagerness to incumber the municipal authority, and to destroy its democratic character, he showed that he was resolved to stretch his prerogative to the utmost. He was ready to trample on all the forms and spirit of German freedom had he not met with vigorous resistance. He published and imposed on all, under the name of *interim*, a profession of faith of twenty-six articles, which should be observed until a general council decided on them. Maurice refused to sign this *interim*; several imperial cities received it with open murmurs; by others it was vigorously resisted. The Protestants had again recourse to arms. Maurice, who had secretly concluded an alliance with Henry II. of France, now threw off the mask, and put himself at the head of the reformers (1552). The campaign opened; Augsburg and several cities were taken. Maurice marched with celerity on Inspruck, where he knew the emperor to be in person, unprovided with troops and unsuspecting of danger. Charles, though tormented with the gout, had time to flee, wretchedly, during a stormy night, across mountains and valleys, carried by a few faithful followers. In a few days a diet assembled at Passau (1552), where a provisional treaty was concluded, by which the emperor conceded to the Protestants most of the privileges they demanded. He was tired of warfare, and, baffled in his ambition, he saw daily the extent of his unpopularity; he undoubtedly thought then of retiring from the world. He wished, however, to leave the empire at peace. With this view he sent troops against his ally, Albert of

Brandenburg, who was not satisfied with his augmentation of territory. Maurice headed the forces destined to humble him, and fell in the battle. Charles, unfortunate in his war against France, was obliged to yield. The convention of Passau was followed by the peace of Augsburg (1555), by the articles of which a religious peace was framed and subscribed by both parties.

Luther died on the 18th of February 1546. He beheld, on his death-bed, the commencement of the conflagration he had lighted up in Europe, as well as of that struggle, the leaders of which were mostly actuated by material and egotistical interests, while the people alone were animated by religious feeling. Luther, it is well known, has been most diversely judged, because his character has scarcely ever been justly appreciated; and let us hope that now it may be fairly examined by all, with a dispassionate and enlightened love of truth. We may admire his occasional zeal for religion, his incorruptible integrity, his unshaken patriotism, his courage, and his aversion to war; but we may regret also his impetuous passions, his unrivalled vanity; his intolerance, never surpassed in the church of Rome; his intense jealousy of all rivals; his ideas often coarse; his language offensively vulgar. The impetuosity with which Luther disseminated his doctrines led to laxity of morals,—a truth acknowledged, with sighs, by Melancthon, in numerous passages of his letters; indeed, it was afterwards acknowledged by Luther himself. His anxiety for the well-being of the people might be called in question; it was probably subservient to his political doctrine. For instance, Henry of Einsiedel, seeing his wretched peasants bent down by the *corvée*, felt so moved by pity and remorse, that he wrote to Luther to ask him whether it were not a wicked sin to deprive those poor men of their time and labour. The reply of the reformer exists, and may be seen in the royal archives of Stuttgart; he wrote to Henry, that “he could maintain this servitude in all conscience, because it was in the order of things, that the common man—the peasant—should be loaded with every charge,

for fear of his kicking." Nevertheless, Henry of Einsiedel suspended for his peasants the odious *corvée*.

But the Reformation had often been attempted before, and at a period when a reformer had the certainty of becoming a martyr; whilst, in the sixteenth century, it was indeed facile to be the expression of the time. Luther was not the originator of most of his tenets, and strange exaggerations are generally believed as to the extent and nature of his Reformation: "Whatever may be the bias of our minds," says Mr. Hallam, "as to the truth of Luther's doctrines, we should be careful not to be misled by the superficial representation we sometimes find in modern writers; such as, that Luther, struck by the absurdity of prevailing superstition, was desirous of introducing a more rational system of religion; or, that he contended for freedom of inquiry, or the boundless privilege of individual judgment; or that his zeal for learning led him to attack the ignorance of the monks, and the crafty policy of the church which withstood liberal studies. These notions are fallacious refinements, as every one who considers the history of the Reformation must discover."

The Reformation, so impetuously disseminated, and being grasped at as an instrument for political ambition, necessarily produced evils that would have been avoided in other circumstances; but those evils are counterbalanced by the good it has given birth to, not only in the Protestant communities, but equally so in the Roman Catholic nations. This general good is well known: it produced an amazing progress in the general state of morals; an improvement in the conduct, feelings and reasonings of men; it favoured exceedingly the development of civil liberty, and was a stimulus to individual activity. The Reformation was a social revolution in all Christian nations. From that great fact in the history of Europe dates the greater spread of civilisation, the general improvement in the social condition of nations, the elevation of the lowest to some degree of estimation in the social state, and the amazing increase of the circle of knowledge. Such were the incalculable advantages derived from that general intellectual insur-

rection. "In my opinion," says M. Guizot, "the Reformation was not either an accident, or a simple view of social amelioration, the fruit of an utopia of humanity and truth. It has a more powerful origin than all this, which supersedes all the private causes. It was a great burst of liberty from the human mind, a new yearning after thinking and judging freely, for one's self, with one's own faculties, of the facts and ideas which hitherto Europe received from the hands of the supreme authority. It is a great attempt at the enfranchisement of the human mind, and, to call things by their names, an insurrection of the human mind, against the absolute power in the spiritual order. Such is, in my opinion, the true, general and predominating character of the Reformation."

The Reformation is divided into two branches—that of Luther and the other of Zwingli and Calvin. John Calvin, born in Picardy, followed Luther, to whose tenets he combined some of those of Zwingli, to both adding peculiar dogmas of his own, remarkable for their boldness. Endowed with a mind far more comprehensive than Luther, of greater subtlety, greater extent of learning, Calvin soon became the greatest of the reformed theologians. He established himself at Geneva in 1534, where he rapidly acquired an unbounded influence. Geneva became the capital of the reformed Church; and the centre from whence Calvin, and, after him, his disciple, Theodore Beza, directed the reformers of France, Switzerland, and Germany. Nor was Calvin powerful in those countries only: his decisions were sought by Cranmer and other English reformers in the establishment of the English church under the sixth Edward. Calvin was even more intolerant than Luther. It is well known that he prevailed on the magistrates of Geneva to consign to the flames the physician Servetus, accused of heresy, and to cut off the head of Gruet for having written some impious letters. He differed from Luther in some of the principal dogmas, and the most violent discussions were on the subjects of the Eucharist and the justification. One prominent feature of the doctrine of Calvin we must mention, because of its social im-

portance. He established that in the sinner the guilt is at once *necessary*, and yet imputable to his will. Strange conclusion, which any man, any Christian, may judge! He established that man is not free—that he is submitted to a predestination, and yet that he is responsible for his action; and this dogma he founded on the fact that the first man, in making a sinful use of his liberty, had caused the ruin of his whole posterity, excepting those whom it pleased God to save by an arbitrary decree. Calvin naturally considered an aristocratical form of government as the best of all; and the general discipline and inexorable distinctions inherent in his doctrine, went far beyond anything that had ever been sanctioned and encouraged by pontifical Rome. Calvin, in his austere zeal for religion, seems to deprive Christianity of Christian tenderness and loving mercy. Is it not apparent in the terror he inspired in his disciples—in his efforts to crush his adversaries—in that fearful religious zeal that made him raise towards heaven a hand that had written on the right of exterminating the heretics, a book worthy of the Inquisition? Even the tender-hearted Melancthon did not approach him without losing some of the soft gentleness of his nature!

We have stated that the political and religious revolution in which the energetic figure of Luther stands pre-eminent, was also beneficial to the Roman Catholic nations: and, in truth, a great moral reaction took place among them, in which the Pontiffs and clergy afterwards participated. Leo X. was too luxurious to submit to it. The Popes Adrian and Clement VII. were absorbed by their political interests in resisting Protestantism, while the latter especially beheld with fear the unceasing augmentation of the imperial authority. Moreover, the moderate factions in both religious parties were endeavouring to effect a conciliation. In this view Paul III. convoked a colloquy at Ratisbon, which remained without any conciliatory result. The Catholic polity entered a new line: in every direction, zealous, austere men tended towards a moral regeneration. Three facts especially evinced this tendency under the pontificate of Paul III.: the resto-

ration of the Inquisition, with new powers more extensive and vigorous—the commencement of the Council of Trent—and the institution of the order of Jesuits.

The urgent necessity of a general reform was felt and demanded by all; it required the convocation of a great council; it was earnestly requested by the emperor. But from some personal reasons the Popes had refused hitherto to convoke one. Paul III. decided at last that this much wished-for general council should meet at Trent (1545). The Protestants were invited to it, but refused to appear; the questions of the Catholic doctrine were soon satisfactorily settled. But when the questions of ecclesiastical discipline were undertaken, new obstacles arose, with endless debates and difficulties; indeed, a state of hostility had always existed between the Pope and the emperor. The Pontiff fearing the preponderance of the imperial authority over the council, resolved to transfer it elsewhere, and the impediments which this change produced occasioned also a suspension of the council (1548), which continued twelve years.

The order of the Jesuits was founded by a Spanish officer, Ignatius Loyola. Obligated, in consequence of a wound, to leave the military service, animated by a burning devotedness to the Papal church, this chivalrous, enthusiastic, mystical soldier, came to Paris, studied with ardour, and rendered himself remarkable by his piety and the purity of his life. Loyola was surrounded by a few friends and disciples; they swore to save Christianity and convert the infidels; they made vows of chastity and poverty; they went to Italy, where their preaching and unremitting activity soon rendered them celebrated; they formed themselves into a body, and framed their code of laws or regulations, which was sanctioned by the Pope in 1540. From that day the Pontiff possessed in his service a devoted *company*, of which Jesus was assumed to be the chief. The basis of the organisation of the Jesuits consists in a blind, passive obedience, unlimited self-denial, and in an unscrupulous, unbounded latitude as to the means for attaining the end in view commanded by the

officers of the order, or their general, who resided at Rome. The activity of the Jesuits to restore the catholic church to its former ascendancy was unceasing, indefatigable, heroic. They more than supplied the place of the old monastic orders, who were no longer distinguished for learning or zeal. These men, who constituted themselves to destroy that which in their conviction was an error, made themselves the blind instruments of the Pope; and they succeeded, by their knowledge, their talents, and their courage, in arresting the progress of the reformed doctrines in several European countries. They were, in fact, the subterraneous crusaders against the Protestant religion throughout Europe. The Jesuits entered afterwards a career of worldly ambition, which, blended with their intolerance, and with the unbounded power which they soon acquired in every Catholic country, cannot render them an object of sympathy in the age we live in; but we believe that no just and enlightened mind can refuse his admiration to men who, by their assiduous study, have conferred greater benefits on literature than any university in Europe, and who, by their religious zeal, have converted more Pagans than all other missionaries put together.

Simultaneously with the Jesuits, other religious congregations of inferior importance were formed, all inspired by the thought of a moral progress. The majority of the cardinals became also rigid, and only elected to the pontifical throne characters worthy of the dignity. Pius IV. re-assembled the Council of Trent;* and in this second period of the council, the reforms in the church were seriously attended to. Many abuses were abolished; many useful institutions were created or renovated. Nevertheless, these reforms were very far from satisfying the expectations of the world. The council was often arrested in its proceedings by various obstacles; many discussions, for instance, took place between the representatives sent by the different nations, and they often led to scenes of extreme violence. The Pope, moreover, was not suffi-

* See Appendix, No. VIII. (c.)

ciently divested of worldly interests, and did not display an exclusive devotedness to the reign of virtue and morality. But with Pius V. (1566), morality assumed the ascendancy at the court of Rome, where great reforms took place, and great activity was displayed. Missionaries were scattered over the east and over America; Rome became the centre of their energetic zeal and of a general progressive movement, which continued under Gregory XIII. and Sixtus V.; and, along with the Jesuits, they saved the church of Rome from a rapid decline. The Catholic church afterwards continued the struggle, but the true, popular, social, catholic spirit of Rome perished with the League in France at the close of the sixteenth century. Afterwards, all religious questions sink under political interests, and under the tendency to individualism, that characterises modern history.

CHAPTER X.

Fourth Period continued.—England.—State of the nation under Henry VIII.—The Reformation introduced.—Edward VI. (1547).—Mary.—Elizabeth (1558).—Establishment of the Church of England.—Government of Elizabeth.—Relations with Scotland.—Mary, Queen of Scots.—James I. (1603).—Spain.—Philip II.—State of Spain.—War against the Turks.—The Netherlands.—Revolt of the Southern Provinces.—They form themselves into Federal States.—Conquest of Portugal (1580).—Death of Philip II. (1598).—France.—Religious dissensions.—Conspiracy of Amboise.—Commencement of the Civil War (1562).—Peace of Longjumeau (1568).—Of St. Germain (1570).—Massacre of St. Bartholomew (1572).—Henry III. (1574).—Treaty of 1576.—The Holy League.—Its Democratic Spirit.—Henry of Guise.—Murder of Henry III. (1589).—Henry IV., of Bourbon, King of France (1593).—His Government.—Assassinated in 1610.—Louis XIII.—Richelieu.—His Character and Policy.—Fall of La Rochelle.—Death of Richelieu and Louis XIII. (1642).—Regency.—The Fronde.—Germany.—Successors of Charles V.: Ferdinand I., Maximilian II., and Rodolf II.—The Latter's Intolerance, and Death (1612).—Mathias, Emperor.—Religious Dissensions in Bohemia.—Ferdinand I., Emperor (1619).—The Thirty Years' War.—The Palatine Period (1619-1623).—Danish Period (1625-1629).—Swedish Period (1630-1635).—French Period (1635-1648).—Ferdinand III. (1637).—The Peace of Westphalia.—Character of this Epoch.—Condition of the different Classes of Society.

ENGLAND, although prepared for a revolution in religious opinions since the attacks of Wickliffe, in the middle of the fourteenth century, received, nevertheless, the Reformation under circumstances very different from those we have seen in Germany. In England, Protestantism was introduced by the royal authority, and assumed at once a form of national exclusiveness and individualism, which has, we believe, exercised a great influence on the English character. It became

an official reformation with the higher classes, totally unconnected with that reformation which penetrated at the same time among all the inferior ranks of the people, through the spontaneous enthusiasm of the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Anabaptists, who flocked to England from Germany, the Netherlands, and Geneva.

This period of the history of England is signalised by a remarkable feature, viz., the complete prostration of the aristocracy and of the citizens in presence of the royal authority. The power exercised by Henry VIII. and Elizabeth was almost absolute. A strange mixture of inert passiveness, with an insensible egotism, seems to have reigned with heavy sway over the English nation. And the worst circumstance in the tyranny and oppression of the royal prerogative, is that its encroachments were established by law; they were legalised by the sanction of those cowardly and disgraceful parliaments, one of which, to its eternal infamy, passed a statute, whereby it was enacted that the king's proclamation should have the force of acts of parliament; and others concurred in the creation of an amazing heap of wild and new-fangled treasons. But, fortunately for the English nation, the arbitrary reign of Henry VIII. was succeeded by the minority of an amiable prince, during which, great part of these extravagant laws were repealed; and during the short reign of Mary, many salutary and popular laws in civil matters were made under her administration.*

The nobility found a consolation against so many arbitrary acts on the part of royalty, in the legal preservation of its privileges, and the considerable wealth it acquired from the spoliation of the clergy. The municipalities were actuated by no other object but that of paying as few taxes as possible. The rural populations rose sometimes with threatening clamours, but were subdued by force of arms. The clergy was so cor-

* The great fact of the reign of Henry VIII. is the incorporation of Wales with England, and the more uniform administration of justice, by destroying some counties palatine, and abridging the unreasonable privileges of such as remained.

rupt, so degraded, that, far from opposing oppression and iniquity, that body silently obeyed, and gave its consent to everything. The acts of external policy of Henry VIII. are of little importance. Although a cotemporary of Francis I. and Charles V., he took a part sometimes in their war, but without deriving any benefit from his participation. Totally incapable as a statesman, his versatile nature led him to aid, sometimes one party, and sometimes the other. Twenty years passed, during which his administration went on unruffled, and without any characteristic feature, with reference to European affairs. His intemperate passions at last broke out to the world. After nearly twenty years' marriage with Catharine of Arragon, aunt of Charles V., he was captivated with the beauty of Anna Boleyn, and solicited Clement VII. for a divorce from Catharine, on the score of her former marriage to his elder brother Arthur. The Pope found himself in the painful dilemma of either affronting the emperor, or mortally offending the king of England; he did not positively refuse, but endeavoured to gain time by preliminaries and negotiations, to no purpose, however. Henry, who had written a book in refutation of Luther, was resolutely bent on accomplishing his wishes immediately; he caused the English clergy, headed by Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, to annul his marriage. The repudiated queen gave place to Anna Boleyn. The Pope issued a Bull, condemnatory of the sentence of the archbishop of Canterbury, and Henry immediately proclaimed himself head of the church of England; the parliament ratified his title, and the Pope's authority was instantly suppressed in all his dominions (1534). He proceeded to abolish the monasteries, and confiscate their treasures and revenues. Two men only resisted—Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More: their heads fell on the block.

But Henry, though a reformer and pope in his own kingdom, had not renounced the religion of Rome; he was equally an enemy to the tenets of Luther and Calvin as to the Pope's jurisdiction in England. He by no means would renounce that title of *Defender of the Faith* which he had deserved by

his book against Luther; he maintained the ancient faith, and persecuted both parties with equal implacability. In 1540, Protestants and Roman Catholics were seen dragged together from the Tower to Smithfield, the former burned as heretics—the latter hung as traitors for denying the *supremacy*. Henry, moreover, soon squandered the enormous property of the monasteries. He is said to have given an estate to one of his cooks, for having prepared a dainty dish. The nobility and gentry of the country complained of the grasping rapacity of the king; the poor, on the other hand, no longer found their subsistence at the charitable gates of the convents. An armed crowd marched upon London; negotiations were opened with the rebels—many promises made; but when they were dispersed, they were hung by hundreds. Henry, it is well known, was as inconstant in his affections as incapable of humanity. He removed Anna Boleyn from the throne to the scaffold, to gratify a new passion for Jane Seymour, who happily died about a year after: to her succeeded Anne of Cleves, whom he divorced in nine months, to make way for Catharine Howard; she underwent the same fate as Anna Boleyn, on a similar suspicion of infidelity. His sixth wife, Catharine Parr, with difficulty retained her hazardous elevation, but had the good fortune to survive the tyrant.

On the death of Henry VIII. (1547), and the accession of his son Edward VI., by Jane Seymour, the Protestant religion was finally established in England, and received many regulations with reference to the liturgy, form of worship, hierarchy, and external ceremonies. The nation sanctioned everything, and numerous executions forced the Catholics to yield. Edward died at the early age of fifteen, and the sceptre passed to the hands of his sister Mary, daughter of Catharine of Aragon, an intolerant Catholic. The Protestant party, headed by the duke of Northumberland, endeavoured to place Lady Jane Grey on the throne; she perished on the scaffold. Mary triumphed. She blindly submitted to the Pope, and married Philip II. of Spain. In her reign, which was but of five years' duration, above eight hundred victims were burnt at the stake,

martyrs to their religious opinions. Old Cranmer, despite his retractations, did not escape the faggot. In 1558, Mary was succeeded by her sister Elizabeth, daughter of Anna Boleyn, a zealous Protestant. In her reign the religion of England became stationary. The hierarchy was established in its present form, the king being by law the head of the church. The liturgy had been settled in the reign of Edward VI. ; in short, the English church was finally constituted by the Act of Uniformity (1571), composed of thirty-nine new articles. The canons are agreeable chiefly to the Lutheran tenets, although the English doctrine may be said to be of a Calvinistic origin, without, however, excluding formally the real presence and the liberty of judgment ; and it differs, moreover, essentially from the Genevese doctrine with reference to the three fundamental points, viz., the hierarchy, the worship, and the royal supremacy. The tenets of the English church were imposed on all by the most severe and sanguinary laws. But already the non-conformists were numerous ; the Catholics, on one hand—the rigid Calvinists, or *Puritans*, and all those who would not admit the hierarchy, the *Presbyterians*, on the other—rejected them.

The authority of Elizabeth was boundless. The parliament was a devoted instrument in her hands ; besides which, extraordinary tribunals, depriving the accused of every guarantee, placed in her hands the lives and fortunes of all her subjects ;—they were *Star Chambers*, *High Commission Courts*, *Court-martials* : but Elizabeth made her extraordinary power serve in the establishment of a firm, wise, and regular administration. Under her reign, England acquired the highest degree of splendour ; her talent enabled her to pursue the true interests of her people, while her vigorous and intrepid mind led her to take an important part in maintaining the balance of power in Europe. She encouraged at home every useful art and manufacture ; she colonised a great part of North America, supported the infant republic of Holland against its tyrannical enemy, humbled the pride of Spain in the defeat of the *Invincible Armada*, and assisted Henry IV. in the recovery of his kingdom. It was her fortune to have the aid of most

able ministers, and her merit to place her confidence in their counsels. Probably she had herself, or her able advisers, penetration enough to discern how the power of the kingdom had gradually shifted its channel, and wisdom enough not to provoke the commons to discover and feel their strength; she therefore threw a veil over the odious part of prerogative, which was never wantonly thrown aside, but only to answer some important purpose; she may be said to have ennobled despotism by the enthusiasm with which she inspired the nation. The commons had generally been in a state of great ignorance, and their personal property comparatively small; the nature of that property had been such as kept them in continual dependence upon their feudal lord, being usually some powerful baron, some opulent abbey, or sometimes the king himself; but now they had enriched themselves by the extension of trade, a comparative division of property, and the progress of agriculture. Though a notion of general liberty had always strongly pervaded and animated the whole constitution, yet the particular liberty, the natural equality and personal independence of individuals were little regarded or thought of. We are now approaching the time when those very principles and sentiments which were heard with detestation and horror, when rudely delivered and carried to absurd extremes by the violence of the Cades and the Tylers, will be applauded with zeal and idolatry when softened and recommended by the eloquence, the moderation, and the argument of a Sidney, a Locke, and a Milton.

The conduct of Elizabeth to her cousin Mary, queen of Scots, has fixed an indelible stain on her character. Scotland had succeeded in keeping her independence; but that unfortunate family of the Stuarts had to oppose a turbulent nobility. Most of the kings of that race met with a violent death. The Scotch were, despite their valour, almost always unfortunate in their wars with the English; a recent alliance between the two crowns did not succeed in establishing a lasting peace; Henry VIII. had defeated the Scotch at Flodden Field. Mary, daughter of James V., and great grand-daughter

of Henry VII., was educated in France, and was married when very young to the dauphin, afterwards Francis II. She had imprudently assumed the arms and title of queen of England by the persuasion of her maternal uncles, the Guises; the pretence was the illegitimacy of Elizabeth. In the meantime the Reformation was received in Scotland with the most ardent zeal; the Catholic bishops, by an ill-judged persecution of the reformers, greatly increased the number of their proselytes; they began to muster their strength, and headed by John Knox, a disciple of Calvin, a virtuous man of the most furious and intemperate zeal, threw down the altars and images, expelled the priests, and demolished the churches and monasteries. The queen-mother, Mary of Guise, aided by French troops, endeavoured to reduce her Protestant subjects; Elizabeth sent an army and a fleet to their assistance, but the death of the queen-mother was followed by a capitulation, by which Mary renounced all pretensions to the crown of England, and the Protestant religion, under Presbyterian forms, was established in the room of the Catholic. Thus Mary, at the age of 18, and on the death of her husband, Francis II., returned to her hereditary kingdom, and her misfortunes commenced from that hour; her Protestant subjects regarded their Catholic queen with abhorrence; she reluctantly married her cousin, Lord Darnley, and a vast conspiracy was formed by her bastard brother, Murray, to ruin the unfortunate queen and usurp the government. Mary, when pregnant, saw her foreign secretary, Rizzio, assassinated at her feet, and afterwards Darnley was blown up with gunpowder; she was accused of having been accessory to his murder; she unfortunately afterwards married the Earl of Bothwell, known as one of the murderers of Darnley, but he had previously made himself master of her person. Murray organised a revolt; the queen was taken prisoner, compelled to resign her crown, but she soon after escaped from her confinement, collected an army, and gave battle to the rebels at Langside, and being defeated, she fled for shelter to England. Elizabeth, who had secretly been the soul of all the disgraceful proceedings against Mary,

had now her hated rival in her hands ; with a consummate hypocrisy she professed a desire to do her justice, while it is well known now that she acquiesced in the forgery of certain letters, said to be written by poor Mary, and plainly intimating her guilt. There were certainly many religious and political reasons which could induce Elizabeth to trample down every principle of right and justice. It was, on the other hand, very natural that Mary should approve of schemes for her own deliverance, and, not very improbably, the Catholics of England were enticed to espouse her cause and to form a plot affecting to threaten the English queen, in order to justify the implacable thirst of Elizabeth for the blood of her beautiful rival. However, a mock trial took place ; it condemned the queen of Scotland to suffer death, and she was beheaded at Fotheringay castle (1587) in the 45th year of her age, and the 19th of her captivity.

And Elizabeth, after such a glorious reign, fell, during the latter years of her life, into a profound melancholy ; she had seen the vanity of all the most splendid earthly glories. The death of Leicester, the tragical end of her favourite Essex, contributed to her heart-stricken gloom. "The pitiable melancholy of her last days," says Mr. Macaulay, "has generally been ascribed to her fond regret for Essex ; but we are disposed to attribute her dejection partly to physical causes and partly to the conduct of her courtiers and ministers. They did all in their power to conceal from her the intrigues which they were carrying on at the court of Scotland ; but her keen sagacity was not to be so deceived ; she did not know the whole, but she knew that she was surrounded by men who were impatient for that new world which was to begin at her death, who had never been attached to her by affection, and who were now but very slightly attached to her by interest. Prostration and flattery could not conceal from her the cruel truth that those whom she had trusted and promoted, had never loved her, and were fast ceasing to fear her. Unable to avenge herself, and too proud to complain, she suffered sorrow and resentment to prey at her heart, till, after a long career of

power, prosperity, and glory, she died sick and weary of the world" (1603).

James VI. of Scotland succeeded by hereditary right to the throne of England, thus uniting the two crowns; but the states of the two countries remained separate, each having its parliament. Scotland had become altogether Presbyterian, and the two countries long remained divided by hatred. James I. adopted the church of England, but he soon became highly unpopular, from his notion of an uncontrollable prerogative; and the current of public opinion was now strongly turned to an extension of the rights of the subject, and retrenchments of the power of the crown. Two conspiracies were discovered for subverting the government, the last of which is celebrated as the gunpowder treason; all the conspirators suffered capital punishment. The weakness of James manifested itself in his external transactions as well as by his internal policy; he had intended forming a matrimonial alliance for his son with Spain, but this project failed, and Charles married Henrietta of France. He had latterly entrusted the public affairs to Villiers, afterwards duke of Buckingham, a man devoid of every talent of a minister, and odious to all ranks of the state. James I. died in 1625, before any explosion of the general discontent, but he left, as an inevitable legacy to his son, a revolution.

Spain, during a part of the sixteenth century, stands foremost in importance and influence, and her immense power, brought into the service of Roman Catholicism, came with a heavy weight over Europe; but this influence and transient grandeur suddenly abandoned Spain, and that country fell at once into the rank of secondary nations, which it has never left since. Philip II., successor of the cosmopolite Charles V., was a purely Castilian prince, who scorned any other language, who abhorred every tenet excepting his own, and whose ambition was to establish everywhere the regular forms of the administration, legislation and religion of Spain; he inherited Spain, and with it Naples, Sicily, Sardinia, Milan, the Netherlands, and all the Austrian possessions in the states of Burgundy, with the vast colonies of America; and, with

truth, he boasted once that the sun never set over his dominions. Philip could well bid defiance to the whole of Europe ; he was an acute politician, with abundance of selfish craftiness, austere, firm, and immeasurably cruel ; he is said to have laughed but once in his life, and that was on hearing of the victory of his army at St. Quentin : he had at heart the greatness of Spain and the absolute restoration of the Catholic religion, and with the aid of the Pope and of France no resistance to his efforts seemed possible. Two causes, however, neutralised those efforts : in the first instance, his Catholicism was a mere restoration, and no more ; it was not animated by that progressive spirit which alone strengthens and vivifies nationalities. A return to a former age was incapable of rousing the enthusiasm of the popular masses ; they have an instinctive yearning for progress. And secondly, there was no unity among the nations submitted to the king of Spain ; they were, on the contrary, distinct nationalities, rival populations divided by a mutual hatred and jealousy. The Spanish monarchy, therefore, did not possess the moral energy necessary to triumph over every resistance ; and when Europe formed a league against that formidable colossal power, it fell at once to the ground.

Philip, during his eventful reign of nearly half a century, attended especially to the external affairs ; his internal administration consisted in an unparalleled despotism, supported by the sanguinary vigilance and executions of the Inquisition. His son, Don Carlos, who sympathised with the lovers of liberty, was given up into the hands of that merciless tribunal (1568). The wretched Moors of Grenada, maddened by oppression, attempted a revolt, but the old Spanish bands arrived and slaughtered them ; old men, women and children in vain knelt in tears imploring for mercy : all were massacred. The king ordered that all those remaining, who were above ten years old, should be reduced to slavery (1571). Intent on the external affairs and the European contest, he did not wish to leave any opposition and resistance behind him. The struggle between Philip and Protestantism appertains chiefly

to the history of France; we have already spoken of it down to the treaty of Cateau Cambresis, in 1559, by which the king of Spain united with Henry II., and sealed the alliance by his marriage with Elizabeth of France, and we will return to it presently: it was a subject of paramount interest for the king of Spain; and the other three great episodes of his reign, viz., the war with the Turks, the revolt of the Netherlands, and the conquest of Portugal, did not materially turn his attention away from his great object.

The Pope was searching for enemies against the Ottoman power in every portion of the globe. The internal security of Spain was frequently endangered owing to the protection granted by the Turks to the Moors, and Venice had seen several of her provinces seized by the iron grasp of the Ottomans; Philip, therefore, and Venice, obeyed the voice of the Pontiff Pius V.; a naval armament was organised, and the command given to Don Juan of Austria, who gained the great naval battle of Lepanto (1571), by which the Turkish domination in the Mediterranean Sea was annihilated.

But the most indomitable resistance that Philip II. met with came from the Netherlands.

The swampy and unproductive nature of these countries, and their liability to inundation by sea, compelled the inhabitants very early to collect in towns for mutual assistance, and to cultivate commerce and manufactures for their support. By these means these towns acquired power and extensive privileges; each province had its provincial states. In the fourteenth century, Philip, duke of Burgundy, became by conquest or inheritance sovereign prince of these provinces, and his grand-daughter Mary transferred them to the house of Austria by her marriage with Maximilian; they continued to flourish under Charles V. The great towns of the Netherlands were then the chief marts of Northern Europe for the trade for the East and the West Indies. Antwerp, above all, was celebrated for its opulence. The Lutheran and Calvinistic opinions made great progress in those provinces. Charles V. had already endeavoured to repress them, and also to limit the

local authorities, and he had met with a vigorous resistance. Philip II. sent Margaret of Parma to govern under the influence of Cardinal Granvelle, and established the Inquisition with plenary power. He wished to submit them to the laws of Spain. William of Orange and the nobles formed a league; they demanded the abolition of the edicts against the Protestants, and a general re-union of the states of the provinces. As they were passing under the windows of Margaret, one of the ministers who saw them defile, said to her, "Do not fear those bands of *gueux*." The leaguers accepted the insult, and the surname of *gueux* remained their title of honour (1565).

The league, however, although hailed everywhere with enthusiasm, did not materially advance its project; fanatical Protestants committed numerous excesses, and many of its members had already abandoned it, when the duke of Alva arrived from Spain as governor, and with a numerous army. He was a skilful general and administrator, but his system was to strike terror by executions and cruelties. In the course of his government, which was of five years' duration, eighteen thousand persons perished by the hand of the executioner, and a hundred thousand fled from the Netherlands. Order was restored (1567). An oppressive taxation soon produced however, new germs of insurrection. The Prince of Orange, who was under sentence of the Inquisition, found no difficulty in raising an army, and he reduced some of the most important garrisons. In 1572, a portion of the Netherlands was already independent. The duke of Alva was withdrawn, and Requesens and Don John of Austria successively commanded after him, without obtaining any decisive results. The prince of Orange was at the head of the league of the North, to which all the provinces acceded, with the exception of the Luxembourg. At last, Alexander of Parma, who was both a profound diplomatist and a consummate general, was sent by Philip to the Netherlands; the new governor took advantage of the internal dissensions of the league—for the northern members of it were Calvinists, whilst those of the south were Catholics, and only fought for their local privi-

leges. The great cities were also divided by commercial rivalries; and Alexander of Parma, in order to save the catholicism of the South, sacrificed without hesitation the royal pretensions, and sanctioned the local privileges. Thus ten provinces (Belgium) were detached from the league, and remained subjects of Spain.

The seven provinces of the North formed a still closer alliance by the solemn treaty of Utrecht (1579), by which it was agreed that they should defend their liberties as one united republic; that they should jointly determine in matters of peace and war; establish a general legislative authority, and maintain a liberty of conscience in matters of religion. William, prince of Orange, was declared their chief magistrate, general, and admiral, with the title of *Stadtholder*. Philip offered 25,000 crowns for his head; and he compassed his revenge, for this illustrious man was cut off by an assassin (1584). His son Maurice, then only eighteen years old, was elected in his room, and sustained his difficult part with great courage and ability. Spain continued the war, but without being able to do any material injury to the provinces; it continued, however, with numerous vicissitudes; Bishop Watson has written an excellent history of this memorable contest. Schiller has also left an admirable fragment of the history of that war. Finally, in 1609, Spain tacitly acknowledged the independence of the United States of the Netherlands, by signing with them a truce of twelve years.

The resistance of the Netherlands, and the losses experienced, were in some degree compensated to Philip II. by the acquisition of Portugal (1580). Muley Mahomet, king of Fez and Morocco, dethroned by his uncle Muley Moluc, had solicited the aid of Don Sebastian, king of Portugal, to regain the throne. Sebastian landed with an army in Africa to conquer the country, but was defeated with immense slaughter, at Aleazar, by the Moors, and slain. Sebastian was succeeded by his grand-uncle Don Henry, who died after a reign of two years. The competitors for the crown were, Don Antonio, and Philip II., paternal and maternal uncles of the last sove-

reign. Philip sent an army with the duke of Alva; the national opposition of the Portuguese was soon vanquished; and Portugal remained sixty years a province of Spain. Philip II. died in 1598, and Spain, fallen from the lofty position she had occupied, commenced, under his successors, Philip III. and Philip IV., a long period of decline. Afterwards, the thirty years' war completed her ruin, while it secured finally the independence of the United States of the Netherlands.

France was the theatre upon which were acted some of the most pre-eminent scenes of the great European drama. The cause of Roman Catholicism was undoubtedly the national cause—the cause of the people—the cause of unity against division—the centre and strength of which dwelt in Paris; it triumphed in the internal affairs of the kingdom, but was vanquished in all the European relations by Protestantism—a fortunate event, however, for the future progress of Europe. Had victory crowned Catholicism in external affairs, that victory would have reduced all nations to be crouching at the feet of Philip II. The history of the religious contest in France is most intricate; it has been disfigured by the Gallican church, by the Parliaments, and by the sceptic philosophy of the eighteenth century; the researches of the historians of our epoch have only lately permitted the discovery of truth, and an impartial examination of the deeds, spirit and object of both parties.

Soon after the voice of Luther had commenced its attacks on the church, the Protestant ideas penetrated into France. The exertions, zeal and genius of Calvin aided their propagation. A great portion of the nobility, emboldened by the example of Germany, favoured them openly; they beheld in them, as in Germany, an effective instrument to attack the centralised unity of power, and to seize upon the ecclesiastical property. Indeed the court was far from being hostile to those ideas. Since the marriage of Henry II. with Catharine of Medicis, the corruption of Italian manners was naturalised at the French court, along with a taste for the literature and fine

arts of that peninsula. Incredulity generally accompanies or follows corruption. Scepticism had already been somewhat fashionable. It has already been stated that while Francis I. was allied with the Protestants of Germany, he beheld his Huguenot subjects writhing on the stake in order to calm the threatening clamours of his Roman Catholic subjects. The doctrine of Calvin had many partisans at court—among them, the poet Clement Marot—and even in the royal family. The reign of his successor, Henry II., we have already spoken of with reference to its military transactions; it is not very remarkable; but before his death, the parties that were going to convulse France had organised themselves, and seemed ready to commence the sanguinary contest.

The populations of the great cities and of the rural districts, with part of the nobility—the great mass of the nation, therefore—were Catholics. Their chiefs were, the great duke of Guise (Francis), who was the idol of the people since his defence of Metz, and since he had taken Calais from the English in eight days; and his brother, the cardinal of Lorraine, counsellor of the Papal See. The Guises governed France during the reign of the youthful Francis II., husband of their niece, the unfortunate Mary Stuart. They had established the ascendancy of Catholicism at court, and a political union with Rome and Spain. Their object was the universal restoration and supreme influence of the Catholic church. At the head of the Protestant party stood two princes of the royal blood, who were no doubt dissatisfied at beholding the whole government vested in the hands of two younger members of the house of Lorraine, viz., Antoine of Bourbon, a descendant of St. Louis, who, by his marriage with Joan of Albret, came into possession of Navarre, the head of the elder branch of Bourbon; and the prince of Condé, chief of the younger branch. They had with them several influential men, among whom was the Admiral of Coligny; they associated the Calvinists to their cause, and held nightly negotiations with the English at St. Denis. But a third party existed also between those two extreme camps; it was a party of

Moderates, composed of that class of wavering men who wish to avoid danger. That party wished for toleration and the *statu quo*, and frequently received the support of the court, because the royal family suffered impatiently the oppressive domination of the Guises, and feared a struggle that would infallibly banish all their worldly pleasures.

Now the Protestants prepared a great *coup d'état*, by the *conspiracy of Amboise*; they marched upon the royal castle, to take possession of the person of the king, but they had some traitors in their ranks—the conspiracy was discovered, and they were massacred on the way. A few only were reserved, to offer the spectacle of their execution to the king and his court; and of these victims, many dipped their hands in the blood of their brethren already beheaded, and raised them to heaven against those who had betrayed them. The malediction of heaven seemed, indeed, to fall upon the great spectators of the gloomy scene. They were—Francis II., soon after cut off in the prime of youth; Mary, who so long lingered at Fotheringay; Francis of Guise, who three years after fell by the hand of an assassin; and Olivier, the chancellor, who had condemned them, expired, his heart being withered by remorse.

The discovery of the conspiracy of Amboise gave naturally a greater influence to Guise. The court supported the *Moderates*, yielded to their conciliatory efforts, and edicts of conciliation were granted at Fontainebleau, afterwards, at the states of Blois. An attempt at conciliation was also made at the Colloquy of Poissy, where Theodore Beza defended the Calvinistic doctrines against the doctors of France, but it completely failed. Nevertheless, Catharine de Medicis continued to obey the influence of the *Moderates*. At the accession of Charles IX. (1561), she held the reins of government, and she could have kept them, but the contempt she inspired debarred her from the possibility of keeping a just balance between the parties. The Colloquy of Poissy and the concession of the edict of St. Germain (1562), which granted liberty of conscience to the Protestants, roused the indigna-

tion of the true Catholics, and restored to Guise the influence and power he had lost. The Protestants, on the other hand, raised their heads, and assumed greater confidence. Sanguinary collisions took place. Whilst a Calvinistic insurrection was breaking out at Nismes, the duke of Guise was passing through Vassy, in Champagne; some of the men of his escort quarrelled with several Huguenots, who were at the door of a church hearing the divine service; the latter were all attacked, and a great number slaughtered (1562). The civil war commenced.

And at the commencement of so fearful a struggle every feeling of patriotism seemed dead—the political barriers that divided the nationalities appeared annulled. The religious question seemed to be all-absorbing, while it was on the surface only—self-interest we believe to have been the root of all. The Protestants received assistance from their brethren of Germany; they gave up Havre to the English, whilst Guise received Spanish succours in men and money, and entered the vast plan of the king of Spain for the extirpation of the Protestant heresy at Geneva and in Navarre, in France and Germany. The decree which condemned the Huguenots, found bearing arms, was the signal of the conflict. A disastrous war spread desolation over France during one year. Guise gained a sanguinary victory at Dreux, where Condé, the general of the Protestants, was taken prisoner. Orleans, the chief centre of the reformers, was only saved by the assassination of the duke of Guise, whom a Protestant shot in the back with a pistol. Montmorency, another great Catholic general, being also taken prisoner, the moderate party again effected a conciliation. Catharine de Medicis no longer feared her dreaded master, Guise; she treated with the Protestants, and by the pacification of Amboise (1563) granted them liberty of conscience.

But the fire of hatred was burning—only covered by the ashes of an apparent reconciliation. The indignation of the Catholics obliged the queen-mother to violate, one after the other, the articles of the treaty of Amboise. A few years

after the Protestants sprang again to arms. Condé and Coligni vainly endeavoured to obtain possession of the king; they were defeated at the battle of St. Denis; nevertheless, continuing to be formidable, they obtained from the court the peace or truce of Longjumeau (1568), which confirmed that of Amboise. Again it was violated. The court, having formed or sanctioned a plot the object of which was to take possession of the persons of the two Protestant chiefs, a third war commenced, during which every act of wisdom and moderation on the part of the court came from the influence of the illustrious Chancellor l'Hôpital, a noble image of calm wisdom, but powerless against the torrent of passions. The Protestants took La Rochelle, made it their central dépôt, instead of Orleans; they received auxiliary troops from Germany, and from the prince of Orange; nevertheless, they were defeated at the battles of Jarnac and Moncontour (1569). Notwithstanding the death of Condé, and the wound of Coligni, the court was obliged to grant the Protestants a third peace—the peace of St. Germain (1570). They obtained that their worship should be free in two cities in every province; the cities of La Rochelle, Montauban, Cognac, La Charité, were left in their hands as guarantees. Henry, the young king of Navarre, was to marry the sister of Charles IX., Margaret of Valois. The fury of the Catholics became frantic. Coligni was even made to hope that he might be sent with an army to the assistance of the Netherlands. The Protestants were certainly amazed on obtaining such unhopèd-for conditions, after having been defeated in four battles, but those who were prudent and wise had a dark foreboding of some impending calamity.

The irritation of the people was intense. The Catholics wished to rival the success of Philip II.; they became exasperated when, at the marriage of the king of Navarre, they beheld those stern, austere Protestants, whom they had so often met on the field of battle, calmly instal themselves in the metropolis, and arrive at court. They watched them—took their manly serenity for an insupportable arrogance. Coligni, it was thought, was rising in high favour at court,

and gaining an ascendancy over the king. Very probably, as demonstrated by Dr. Lingard, the massacre of St. Bartholomew was more a political than a religious monstrosity. The general feeling was, that France could only be saved by a *coup d'état*; and, no doubt, the possibility of such an event influenced the motives that led the Catholics to sign the peace of St. Germain. The wavering, feeble nature of Charles IX. accounts for his conduct. He would quite as easily have consented to the massacre of the Catholics as that of the Protestants, at the instigation of his mother. On the 24th of August 1572, the day of St. Bartholomew, between two and three in the morning, the church bells began to ring, and young Henry of Guise, thinking he was avenging his father, commenced by presiding over the murder of Coligni. Nothing was heard but the cry of *Kill! Kill!* Most of the Protestants were butchered in their beds. A Catholic boasted having purchased from the murderers more than thirty Huguenots, to put them to the rack at his pleasure. The king is said to have fired on the Protestants from a window in the Louvre. The king, queen-mother, and ladies of the court, went to see *what remained of the admiral*, says Thuanus (v. 32, p. 233). Something more horrible, perhaps, than the massacre of St. Bartholomew, was the joy it inspired to the Catholic world. At Rome, medals were struck in commemoration of the day. Philip II. wrote to the court of France a letter of congratulation. That great crime, however, proved useless. In many cities, the governors refused to obey the orders to slaughter the Protestants. The horror of St. Bartholomew brought over many partisans and auxiliaries to the cause of the reformers, who taking refuge in La Rochelle and other cities of the South, defended themselves with desperate valour. Charles IX. only survived eighteen months that memorable day of murder, during which he lingered a prey to awful visions of blood: at last, his own blood oozed out from all his pores, and he died (1574). His brother, Henry III., hastily returned from Poland, to grasp the crown of France.

Several treaties and truces between Catholics and Protest-

ants were made and broken in the meantime. At this period, more especially, the political character of the struggle became predominant. The exclusive object of the chiefs was self-aggrandisement. Finally, by the treaty of 1576, the king granted to the Calvinists the liberty of worship in the whole kingdom, with the exception of Paris, with a share in the parliaments, and several cities for their safety. Evidently, the crown favoured them, and thus irritated the people. Whatever sympathy the nation might yet feel for the royal family, in truth the scandals and corruption of the court had alienated the whole country. This corruption had never ceased augmenting since Francis I. There was not a crime and a debauchery omitted as a usual practice at the court of France: the vile Henry III. sums up in himself every infamy. Those considerations determined the final formation of the celebrated Holy League (1577), to which most of the cities adhered, Paris being its centre. Its principles, so truly democratical, were propagated among the masses by furious predications from the Christian pulpit; they were, that the people alone is the true temporal sovereign, and has the right of deposing bad kings, and of assassinating tyrants—that power comes from God through the medium of the people—and that a sovereign is only legitimate as long as he is faithful to the national laws and religion. The propagation of such doctrines soon carried their fruits. The league voted articles of union, by which the king was considered as incapable of protecting and governing his subjects, and each engaged himself to maintain, at the expense of his blood and fortune, the ancient laws and religion of the monarchy, and to save the national unity. Henry of Guise, who had proved himself as distinguished as his father, and as devoted to the cause of Roman Catholicism, was indicated by all as the great chief of the league and of the nation.

The throne of Henry III. was tottering. He was childless, and the succession of Henry of Bourbon, king of Navarre, was impossible. There was one party urging to the establishment of a republic—another proposing to give the crown to Henry

of Guise, and to establish a royalty, surrounded with democratical institutions. A mighty revolution was imminent, yet it was baffled by the most fortuitous circumstances. The league took up arms; but Henry III. proclaimed himself its chief, and re-commenced the war against the Huguenots; he found himself defeated by the Protestants, and accused by the Catholics of unjustifiable hesitation and bad will. The victory of the king of Navarre at Coutras (1587), where shone with *éclat* his valour and magnanimity, completed the indignation of the Catholics; and whilst the league was perfecting its organisation, Henry III. was giving in Paris the spectacle of his scandalous prodigalities and disgusting debauchery. He forbade Henry of Guise to enter the capital. The duke braved him, and was received with the enthusiastic acclamation of the whole population. The court, despite the efforts of Guise, was bent upon measures of violence. The Swiss guards were ordered to enter Paris. They would all have been butchered without the interference of the duke. Then the insurrection known by the name of *day of the barricades* broke out. Perhaps on that day Guise had his hand on the crown of France; however, old Catharine de Medicis gained time by sending him various propositions. The king fled to Chartres, but saw himself abandoned, and felt terrified at the unanimous spirit of the provinces. He gave his consent to all the demands of the Parisians: Guise was appointed commander-in-chief of the armies of the kingdom, and the states-general convoked at Blois; but they were devoted to the league. Guise spared no outrage to the king; so much so, that he drove that most timid and corrupt imbecile to a bold deed—that of murdering him: the duke, despite of the nine warnings he had received, persisted on going to the royal council; he was assailed and stabbed in the room adjoining that of the king (1588).

When the news of the death of Guise reached Paris, the whole population mourned. The Sorbonne declared the nation free from the oath of fidelity. Mayenne, brother of the murdered duke, was elected chief of the league. Henry

III., on the other hand, abandoned by all, had no other resource but that of joining the king of Navarre and the Huguenots. He came with Henry to besiege Paris, but the people, maddened by the thirst of vengeance, avenged one assassination by another. A young monk, Jaques Clement, requested an interview with the king, and plunged a knife in his abdomen. The monk was hailed as a saint; his image was offered to the adoration of the people in the churches (1589). The royal army proclaimed Henry IV., of Navarre, king of France. Henry defeated Mayenne and his army of leaguers and Spaniards at the battle of Arques, and on the following year at Ivry. He then came to besiege Paris. That unfortunate city, a prey to the rage of the leaguers and the tyranny of a Spanish soldiery, was reduced to the most cruel extremities of famine: bread was made with the bones of the dead—mothers ate their children. The heart of Henry was moved by such sufferings; he ordered the besieged to be fed. Paris was not taken, however, and the general sent by Philip II., Alexander of Parma, by a skilful manœuvring, obliged the king of France to raise the siege.

In the meantime, the ties that held the league together were becoming daily more loose. This very intervention of Spain contributed to its fall. Europe saw with terror the arrogant interference of Philip; even the Pontiff was alarmed, and secretly exulted at the success of Henry IV. The moderates, longing for peace, exerted themselves; they gave secret hopes to Henry IV. In vain they were expelled from parliament. Besides them, the league now became divided into two factions—that of the Guises, nobility and parliament, and that of Spain, hoping to place on the French throne a Spanish infanta. Mayenne repressed the latter, but, at the same time, he deprived the league of its democratical energy (1590, 1591). But the Guises, however, twice defeated, and besieged in Paris, could not dispense with the assistance of those very Spaniards whose influence they feared, and whose agents they proscribed. Subsequently, divisions broke out in the states of Paris (1592, 1593). Mayenne baffled the pre-

tensions of Spain, not to his own advantage, however; and Henry IV. now saw that the best conciliating step to take was, to become himself a Roman Catholic. He abjured Protestantism (1593), and the league was dissolved. His progress then became very rapid. On the following year the gates of Paris fell before him; he pardoned everybody; the Roman Catholic nobles sold themselves successively to him, and the absolution of the Pope completed his triumph.

Now the king turned against the Spaniards the military ardour of the nation. The Spanish war became a national war, and, notwithstanding the fall of Amiens, taken by surprise, the French were everywhere successful. In the memorable year of 1598, the peace of Vervins was concluded. Philip II. was finally obliged to yield, all his plans having failed—his treasures exhausted—his navy ruined. The king of France terminated, at the same time, the internal dissensions, in granting, by the *Edict of Nantes*, religious toleration and political guarantees to the Protestants. Under Henry IV. France emerged from her ruins. Notwithstanding his levity and want of deep convictions, he certainly deserves the title of which he was most ambitious—that of restorer of France. Assisted by his minister, Sully, every branch of the administration was reformed, agriculture encouraged, the manufactures of silk, tapestry and glass established, and Paris embellished. France had become the arbiter of Europe. Henry continued the task commenced by Louis XI., and terminated by Richelieu, viz., the extirpation of the arrogant ambition and federal tendencies of the nobles. Their pride had augmented; they were aiming at forming hereditary governments; but, when they saw the duke of Biron lose his head on the block, and the duke of Bouillon baffled in his pretensions, they felt that a superior power presided over the destinies of France. Then, Henry turned his attention exclusively to the European policy: he effected a reconciliation between the Pope and Venice, and had formed a project of a European federation. He had made mighty preparations to humble the house of Austria: hostilities had already commenced on account of the succession

of Cleves and Juliers, in his giving his support to the competitors repelled by Austria, when, on the 14th May 1610, he was assassinated by Ravaillac, while passing in his carriage in a street of Paris. The murder of this illustrious monarch had been attempted seventeen times before.

The son of Henry IV., Louis XIII., was a minor, which circumstance checked the progress of royalty. France, in the hands of a child, of his mother, Marie de Medicis, declared regent, and of the Italian minister Concini, could not continue the martial policy of Henry IV. Not being able to wage war with Austria they sought her alliance. On the other hand, the nobles raised their heads and threatened: to avoid the civil war, all the treasure left by Henry IV. was abandoned to their greediness; afterwards an assembly of the states-general took place (1614), the last before that of 1789, in which nothing was done to answer the general expectations. The nobles had again recourse to force; they formed an alliance with the Protestants; but this time Concini had the Prince de Condé arrested. A court intrigue ruined Concini, marshal of Ancre. Louis XIII. was persuaded by young de Luynes to shake off the despotic influence of his mother and her minister. Concini was assassinated, and his widow burnt as a sorceress. The Protestants were becoming daily more menacing in the South. Luynes exasperated them by the annexation of Bearn to the crown. He took the command of the royal army, and failed disgracefully in an attack on Montauban, to which he had taken the king; he died in this campaign (1621). The queen-mother resumed her exertions; it was, nevertheless, only two years after, that she succeeded in introducing Richelieu into the Council of the Ministers (1624); it was the triumph of the national policy.

Richelieu governed France nearly twenty years. During the whole of that period, he pursued, with an indefatigable perseverance, the great object of his policy; viz., to render France the first and most powerful nation in Europe, and the destruction of all the internal tendencies that opposed her unity. Gifted with a genius at once profound and inflexible,

he was reckless about the means to obtain his end—the block, the bastille, poison, were all alike to him; perjury became a virtue if it served his purpose;—terrible doctrine, which left Richelieu, on his death-bed, without any doubt as to his justice, and without remorse! Weak and sickly, exhausted by unceasing labour, the irritability and darkness of Richelieu's nature, stung by the hatred and vengeance he inspired, and by the wretched court plots and intrigues which marred the execution of his grand projects, attained, sometimes, a terrible pitch of cold and cruel exasperation: the loftiest heads rolled on the scaffold; great personages were flung into the bastille and disappeared; he had secret tribunals and secret executions in his own palace at Ruel; but all was for the grandeur of France—object of the fanaticism of the great cardinal who possessed moreover the advantage of which he boasted:—to curb, overthrow, destroy, annihilate, all that opposed him; and then cover the whole with his scarlet robe. And he did proceed with a terrible inflexibility—finding in the king a docile instrument, and assuming gradually the tone of a master in his very presence. The sole merit of Louis XIII. was the constant, persevering confidence and protection he granted to his minister, the terrible cardinal, whom at the same time he both feared and hated.

Internally, Richelieu saw the inevitable necessity of subduing the Huguenots and the nobility. Of his external policy we will speak of presently, when dwelling on the affairs of Germany. By the edict of Nantes, Henry IV. had granted the Protestants not only liberty of conscience, but very extensive political rights: they had in their possession a standing army, two hundred cities and castles; they were represented in Parliament, and held political assemblies. They formed a sovereignty in the kingdom. In a great assembly held at La Rochelle, they had given a perfect, admirable organisation to their dominion. It was indisputably a complete federalism, the evident tendency of which was to constitute a republic, similar to that of the Netherlands, in the heart of France. Richelieu saw in this the ruin of France. The war commenced—La Rochelle

was attacked. A fop, Buckingham, who publicly declared himself in love with the queen of France, and had been turned out of the kingdom, persuaded the English government to assist the Huguenots of France. La Rochelle, strengthened by the support of England, was exulting. Richelieu concentrated all the French forces round that city, and, after a desperate resistance of one year, the proud metropolis of French Protestantism fell into the hands of the Cardinal. The Huguenots of Languedoc were defeated; and a peace was concluded, granting the Protestants liberty of conscience and civil equality with the Catholics, but depriving them of their rights of forming assemblies, of their fortresses, and of all those privileges which enabled them to form an hostile sovereignty in the realm (1628).

In the meantime Richelieu was assailed by dark courtly intrigues; he had to oppose all the bad passions, envy and ambition of courtiers and princes; and often had to exert his consummate skill to preserve his ascendancy over the king. The duke of Orleans, the king's brother, was at the head of his foes. Young Châlais, who had conspired in his favour, perished on the scaffold (1626). Later (1630), the queen-mother formed a league to overthrow the minister; she was on the point of succeeding; Richelieu saw the king, and obtained permission to have her arrested. In 1632 many of the first nobles, headed by the marshal of Montmorency, raised the standard of revolt; they had formed an alliance with Spain and Lorraine. They were defeated at Castelnaudary; and Richelieu had Montmorency beheaded at Toulouse. The inquisitorial police of the minister ensured tranquillity during a few years. Nevertheless, in 1642, after an abortive revolt of the count of Soissons—a favourite of the king—Cinq-Mars aspired also at dethroning the dying cardinal; he had likewise secretly treated with the Spaniards. Richelieu succeeded in procuring a copy of the treaty, and the head of Cinq-Mars fell on the block. Whilst the great minister was thus struggling at home, the thirty years' war was going on in Germany; and he entered that great contest as soon as the internal affairs of France permitted it, by his subsidies to the Protestants,

and by discovering in the snows of the North, the hero of that war, Gustavus Adolphus, whom he launched against Austria.

Richelieu went to his grave in 1642. His death was a universal rejoicing. The people made songs to celebrate it. Louis XIII. died five months after him, leaving an infant son, (six years old), and the regency, to his widow, Anne of Austria. A re-action against the policy of Richelieu was impending; but the queen left the government in the hands of Mazarin, recommended to her by the great cardinal, and the same external policy was continued. The nobles vainly attempted the ridiculous revolution of the *Fronde*. Their exorbitant pretensions had become inadmissible. Absolute monarchy was established in France, and French preponderance constituted in Europe.

Germany did not take much part in the general affairs of Europe under the three successors of Charles V.—Ferdinand I., Maximilian II., and Rodolf II. The house of Austria was acquiring more and more the whole authority of the imperial state. Ferdinand's great object was to preserve internal tranquillity, by continuing the good understanding between the rival parties in religion. He would not allow the Catholics to suppress in their own states the exercise of the reformed religion; nor, to gratify the Protestants, would he abolish the ecclesiastical reservation. Unfortunately, he laboured in vain to effect a union between them. The more remarkable facts of his reign were—the appearance of the Jesuits in Germany; the closing of the Council of Trent, which finished its sittings without touching some of the grossest abuses of the Catholic church; and the substitution of the *diets of deputation* for the general diets. They consisted of deputies returned from the several electoral and imperial cities, with the elector at their head, which rendered their convocation more easy in cases of emergency. Maximilian II. (1564) continued his father's efforts to preserve the religious peace. He persuaded the Calvinists, Lutherans, and Roman Catholics, to refrain from open hostility for the

common good. His conduct towards them was actuated by prudence and impartiality; he always recommended union, concord, peace, toleration, and mutual regard. But with the accession of his son Rodolf (1576) commenced a period of intolerance and misfortunes. He was a bigot by education and sentiment, void of judgment and firmness, and aided the commencement of the struggle for supremacy between the two religious principles. His first act of intolerance was to prohibit the public exercise of the Protestant religion in his hereditary states of Austria. The inveterate hatred which divided the followers of Calvin from the disciples of Luther, afforded Rodolf the prospect of weakening, and ultimately of subjugating, both. Vexations and injustice abounded undoubtedly on both sides—Roman Catholics and Protestants; and the fierce religious enthusiasm of all, rendered them insensible to their duties as citizens or as reasonable men. Austria, Styria, Bavaria, and the ecclesiastical electorates, were faithful to the tenets of Rome. Brandenburg, Saxony, Hesse, Wurtenburg, Baden, remained Protestants, despite the efforts of the Jesuits; the Palatinate was Calvinistic. The Protestants, apprehensive lest they should be unable to withstand the Roman Catholic states, placed Henry IV. of France at the head of their confederation or *union*. Rodolf persevered in his impolitic course of exasperating, instead of conciliating, the dissidents. Numerous insurrections attested the bigotry of his measures. On the death of the duke of Juliers, Cleves, and Berg, without issue, both parties hoped to obtain possession of this beautiful country. Until the legal decision could be pronounced by the Aulic Council as to the succession, Rodolf placed the three duchies under sequestration. But the reformed princes pretended to discover that the emperor was resolved that these provinces should not be held by a Protestant, although he had entered into an engagement with the elector of Saxony, on whom, it seems, he had conferred the contested investiture; yet they made the question one of religion, and applied for aid to Henry IV. His assassination put a stop to the general explosion of a European war. But

the animosities were too intense. Peace could not be of long duration.

Rodolf's intolerance and pusillanimity successively wrested from him the greater portion of his dominions. As he had no issue, his presumptive heir was his brother Matthias, whom he constituted governor of Austria and of Hungary. Matthias had acquired great fame during the war against the Turks; he perceived the detestation in which the emperor was held, and by favouring the Protestants of Hungary and Austria, by intrigues, bribes, and by his persuasive eloquence, he obtained the throne of Hungary, entered on the actual government of Bohemia, and established his authority in Austria. Rodolf, in the meantime, was devoted to his astrological and alchymical pursuits; he did not long survive the rejoicings attending the coronation of his brother at Prague; a sombre melancholy and a tendency to aberration had long afflicted him, and brought him to his grave (1612).

Matthias procured, without difficulty, the suffrages of the electors for the imperial crown. Yet, as no king of the Romans had been elected during the preceding reign, there was a short interregnum. His reign exhibits the same animosity on the part of the religious rivals. The passions had turned the affairs of the three duchies, which was originally a civil, into a religious question; and it continued to harrass the court and country. The French and Dutch had before advanced to assist the Protestant claimants; now, the Spaniards were introduced to support the Roman Catholics, and all were exclusively actuated by worldly considerations. The evangelical union gradually acquired strength. By the marriage of its youthful head, Frederic V., elector palatine, with Elizabeth, daughter of James I., in 1614, it hoped to acquire a still greater power: on the contrary, this very prince did more to injure the Protestant cause than the bitterest of its enemies. In Bohemia, the year preceding the death of Matthias, religious hatred burnt more fiercely than ever. The archbishop of Prague, incensed that the dissidents should continue to build conventicles on their own domains, demolished a few.

Instantly, the Bohemians were in arms; led by the count of Thurn, an impetuous Protestant, of great ambition, they hurled the four royal governors of Prague from the windows of the municipal hall (1618). The Bohemians pretended this to be an *ancient custom of their country*, to hurl from a window the ministers who had prevaricated: they would not be pacified, and the war became general, although desultory. In the meantime, Matthias died: he had no issue. His nephew, the pupil of the Jesuits, Ferdinand, of the Styrian branch, who was king of the Romans, and detested by the Protestant party—after an interregnum of six months, and many difficulties—succeeded him (1619). The causes of that disastrous thirty years' war were in full operation. The states of Bohemia refused to acknowledge Ferdinand, and declared the throne vacant. They afterwards elected the Count Palatine Frederic V., a vain and weak prince, void of any talent for the station: aid was expected from his father-in-law, James I. of England, but no hope was ever more unfounded.

The thirty years' war, the history of which is well known, owing to Schiller's history, and other works of eminence, is very distinctly divided into four periods, the prominent features of which we must briefly mention:—*The Palatine Period* (1619-1623).—Whilst the Bohemians were giving the crown to the Prince Palatine, who hastened to Prague, with his vain consort, the chief cause of his woes, to consult with his Calvinistic clergy on the means of defending the kingdom, Hungary threw off the yoke of Ferdinand, and elected Bethlem Gabor, of Transylvania. The Austrian states were overrun by the Protestant generals. The emperor was, during one moment, besieged in Vienna by the Bohemians, but supported by the duke of Bavaria, by the Catholic league of Germany, and by the Spaniards: he forced his enemies to quit Austria, and fly to the succour of Bohemia. In the meantime, Frederic, the new king of Bohemia, contrived to disgust both his Catholic and his Lutheran subjects, by his Calvinistic fanaticism. His father-in-law, James I., contented himself with negotiating in his favour. In a few days, he was expelled from a kingdom

which he had not courage to defend, or wisdom to conciliate. When besieged and attacked in the capital of Bohemia, he lost the battle of Prague by his cowardice: he was dining peaceably at the castle, while they were dying for him in the plain (1621). The valour of the heroic adventurer, Mansfeld, and other partisans, who ravaged Germany in his name, was all in vain. Frederic was driven away from his hereditary state, which was occupied by the Bavarian and imperial troops, and fled to the Low Countries. The emperor chastised Bohemia, and gave way to his vindictive nature: he suffered no considerations of justice to arrest him in his reckless vengeance. By one decree, seven hundred of the noblest families were proscribed—their estates confiscated. Hungary was soon forced to yield, Gabor humbly suing for peace. The Palatinate was divided among the Catholic princes; and the electoral dignity, attached to it, invested in the duchy of Bavaria; the ban of the empire being published against Frederic and his chief adherents.

Danish Period (1625-1629).—The Protestant states of Lower Saxony were in consternation; they feared being forced to a restitution of the ecclesiastical property; they began to draw closer the relaxed bonds of their union, and sought the aid of England, Sweden, and Denmark. Ambition, or love of religion, probably both blended, induced Christian IV., king of Denmark, to arm, and place himself at the head of the confederates, whose ranks were increased by some English, Scotch, and Dutch adventurers. Ferdinand II., preparing for this new war, did not wish to remain dependent on the Catholic League, which was headed by the duke of Bavaria, and whose army was commanded by the celebrated Tilly. The count of Wallenstein (or, rather, Waldstein), officer in the service of the emperor, offered to raise an army, provided he might be allowed to make it amount to fifty thousand men. He kept his word. A multitude of adventurers, who had no resource, and wished to live by plunder, collected round him. At the head of this motley horde, Wallenstein imposed his will on the friends as well as the foes of the emperor. He

defeated Christian IV. at Lutter; subdued Pomerania, and received from the emperor, as a reward, the two duchies of Mecklenburg, with the title of *General of the Baltic*; he besieged the powerful Stralsund (1628), which he swore to take, even if it were bound to heaven with chains of adamant; nevertheless, the opulent city, being assisted by the Swedes, was saved. The whole north of Europe was in a state of terror. The emperor, however, to throw division among his enemies, granted a peace to Denmark, and, after the retreat of Christian, he resumed his vindictive measures: he proved himself as overbearing in prosperity as he had been constant in adversity. The exercise of the Protestant religion he abolished in Bohemia. The more influential dissidents were exiled, or put to death; the common people were forced to change their faith. Above 30,000 families, comprising the most laborious and useful of the population, preferring their consciences to their country and friends, sought refuge in the Protestant states. Ferdinand, emboldened by the facility with which his atrocious decrees were carried into execution, was preparing to extirpate the Protestant religion from other parts of Germany: he began by insisting on the restitution of such ecclesiastical property as the Protestants had usurped since the peace of Passau. In the meantime, with the peace, the army of Wallenstein fell back upon Germany like a swarm of locusts, devouring everything. In some states, the spoliation and plundering were unparalleled. The distress of the inhabitants attained the acme of earthly wretchedness: many were seen digging out the dead bodies to satisfy their hunger; corpses were found with their mouths still filled with the raw herbs of the roadside.

Swedish Period (1630-1635).—The sweeping measures of the emperor, his rising power, the strict union which reigned between the Spanish and German branches of the Austrian house, began to throw alarm and jealousy among the Catholics themselves. They secretly persuaded the Protestants to resist the further execution of the edict of restitution. When Ferdinand requested that his son might be elected king of the

Romans, the diet of Ratisbon demanded, in strong language, the reduction of his vast army, and the dismissal of the hated Wallenstein. In truth, the Catholics and Protestants appeared to have formed an unexpected union: both led to it, also, by the horrible excesses committed by the imperial troops, and by the intrigues of France and of Richelieu. The French Cardinal persuaded the emperor to sacrifice Wallenstein; and, in the meantime, was preparing the invasion of Germany by Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden, who, filled with the ambition of becoming the head of the reformed league, easily yielded to the persuasions of Richelieu. Gustavus Adolphus was the hero of the North. He had forced Denmark and Russia to make peace, and had taken possession of some of the maritime provinces of Poland. He entered the Germanic empire in 1630. Ferdinand did not fear, at first, this *king of snow*, as he called him, who would melt in advancing towards the south. But he did not know that the Swedes were men of iron. The genius of Gustavus, by an impetuous manœuvring, which sacrificed all to the rapidity of the movements, disconcerted the German routine. Gustavus penetrated into the very heart of the Austrian states; humbled, one by one, the Catholic electors, and forced the electors of Brandenburg and Saxony to support the Protestant association. He defeated Tilly at the sanguinary battle of Leipsic (1631); and, afterwards, the duke of Lorraine. He penetrated into Alsace, and subdued the electoral states of Treves, Mainz, and the Rhine. Bavaria and Bohemia he alike invaded at the same time. Tilly was mortally wounded in defending the river Lech: in fine, Austria was uncovered, and exposed in every quarter.

The emperor was obliged to have recourse to the proud Wallenstein, who scornfully resisted the entreaties of Ferdinand, and of the Catholics. He only yielded when he obtained in the empire a power nearly equal to that of the emperor. He saved Bohemia, and advanced towards Nuremberg, to meet the king of Sweden. During three months, those two great men stood encamped opposite each other.

At last, Wallenstein moved. The king of Sweden followed him, and attacked him at Lutzen (1632). Here the Swedish hero fell; and his army, in avenging his death, gained a great victory. The war was vigorously prosecuted by the regent, Oxenstiern, and Wallenstein went to seclude himself at Prague, with a royal retinue, waiting the opportunity of gratifying his unbounded ambition. Europe had her eyes on the threatening solitude of this terrible man—who spoke little, who never laughed, who was rarely seen, and who never addressed his soldiers but to pronounce their death, or a princely reward. Ferdinand, exasperated at the arrogance and ambition of Wallenstein, decided upon acting as Henry III. had done with Guise. The formidable general was assassinated at Egra, and the emperor, remembering the services he had rendered the empire, ordered three thousand masses for the repose of his soul (1634). The cause of the Protestants now appeared on the wane. Ferdinand succeeded in sowing dissensions among the reformed princes: his eldest son, Archduke Ferdinand, gained over them the great victory of Nordlingen, and pursued the advantage. In 1635, the elector of Saxony, in a treaty at Prague, was reconciled to the emperor. The Swedes were not strong enough to hold out alone in Germany. France came, in her turn, on the field of battle.

French Period (1635-1648).—Richelieu had trampled down every opposition and internal foe; he could now attempt victories in a foreign land. He secured, by handsome subsidies, the services of the successor and best general of the school of Gustavus Adolphus—Barnard, duke of Saxe-Weimar, and his army. After the truce of twelve years, the united provinces of the Netherlands had been obliged to re-commence the war with Spain, which was no longer a civil contest, but a real scientific war, in which the profound experience of the celebrated Spanish general, Spinola, was counterbalanced by that of Prince Frederic Henry, brother and successor of Maurice. Richelieu formed an alliance with the Dutch, with the intention of dividing with them the Spanish Netherlands; meditating, in the meantime, the acquisition of Roussillon, at

the other extremity of France. He formed, also, an alliance with the duke of Savoy, in order to secure the passage of the French armies into Italy. The war, however, was arduous at the commencement, and, for a time, dangerous and threatening to France. The imperial army entered Burgundy: the Spaniards invaded Picardy. The enemy was only within thirty leagues of Paris. The French court was preparing to fly; the minister himself was bewildered: the Spaniards, however, were repelled (1636). Barnard of Weimar gained for France the splendid victories of Rheinfeld and Brisach; continued his triumphs; took fortresses reckoned before impregnable; and was thinking, it seems, of forming for himself an independent sovereignty on the Rhine, at the expense of France, when he died, fortunately for Richelieu, being only thirty-six years of age, in 1639.

But in 1637, Ferdinand III., king of Bohemia and of Hungary, succeeded the emperor, his father, in virtue of his election as king of the Romans, to the imperial throne, without opposition. He followed the policy of his father. The war was renewed with fury, but nothing very decisive for either party was the result. If victory was gained one day by the combined Swedes and French, assisted by the open or secret wishes of some Protestant states, it was neutralised on another by an equally signal advantage to the imperial troops. But this harassing warfare—the excesses committed on every side were preparing the internal ruin of Germany. The system of war, however, had assumed a totally different character. Since Gustavus Adolphus, a new, freer, superior genius seemed to inspire it. Tactics seemed somewhat spiritualised. The military world lost some of its confidence in the pure material force, and entertained some faith in moral power. To the fanaticism of Tilly and Ferdinand II., to the revolutionary genius of Wallenstein, and of the duke of Weimar, had succeeded the profound tacticians Piccolomini and Mercy, generals of the emperor; and at the head of the Swedish army were Banner, Tortenson, and Wrangel, trained at the school of the great king of Sweden, and who successively had the

command. In 1640, the war became highly favourable to France. Spain, by the revolt of Catalonia and Portugal, was reduced to keep on the defensive. The house of Braganza ascended the throne of Portugal, to the great satisfaction of the whole of Europe. The French were victorious in Italy; in the Netherlands they took Arras and Thionville. In 1643, a few days after the death of Louis XIII., the great Condé gained the splendid victory of Rocroy. On the following year, he carried the strongest positions on the Rhine. In 1645, he again completely defeated the Imperialists at Nordlingen; took Dunkerque in 1646; finally, on the 20th August 1648, his victory of Lens, in Artois, simplified the negotiations for the peace that had so long been commenced: the peace of Westphalia was signed on the following 24th October.

But France had previously evinced a positive disinclination to overpower the house of Austria when the triumphs of the Swedes were too rapid. On one occasion she refused to join them to strike a last blow on Austria, on the pretence of the vigilance required for the protection of her new conquests, Alsace and Lorraine. The Swedes conquered for a while without the assistance of the French. Their general, Tortenson, who was a paralytic, always carried on a litter, and who astonished Europe by the rapidity of his movements, had renewed at Leipsic the glorious day of Gustavus Adolphus (1642). He had defeated the Danes, the secret allies of the emperor, and, finally, his alliance with Transylvania permitted him to penetrate into Austria (1645). Vienna trembled. The defection of his ally, and the retreat of Tortenson, saved the emperor.

Negotiations for peace had already commenced in 1636; they were not followed up, nor were they sincere on either side. Preliminaries of peace were signed in 1642. The death of Richelieu roused the hopes of Austria, and removed her ideas of pacification. Again, from the vicissitudes of war, from the consequent elation of one party and the depression of the other, years elapsed before the negotiations were brought

to a conclusion. They were carried on at Osnaburg and Munster. Finally, the victories of Condé, those of Turenne, and of the Swedes, and, lastly, the victory of Wrangel, as well as that of Condé, decided the emperor to sign the celebrated treaty of Westphalia. The war continued between France, Spain, and Portugal, and was terminated by the treaty of the Pyrenees in 1659, by which France obtained the Roussillon and several fortified places in the Low Countries, and Louis XIV. married Maria Theresa, infanta of Spain.

The *peace of Westphalia* will ever be memorable, both from its having served as the foundation of the international law of Europe, of the policy generally adopted by each state, and from its having correctly defined the claims of Protestants and Roman Catholics, the bounds of the imperial, the electoral, the aristocratical, and the municipal powers. The treaty of Westphalia may, in the strictest sense, be considered as the key of modern history. Its principal articles were—firstly, The peace of Augsburg (1555), confirmed and extended to the Calvinists. Secondly, The sovereignty of the various states of Germany, in the extent of their territory, sanctioned, as well as their rights, at the general diets of the empire; those rights being guaranteed, in *the interior*, by the composition of the imperial chamber and of the Aulic Council, in which the Protestants and the Catholics were to be in future admitted in equal number; and at *the exterior*, by the mediation of France and Sweden. Thirdly, Indemnities adjudged to several states; and, in order to form them, a large portion of ecclesiastical property was secularised. *France* obtained Alsace, the bishoprics of Philisburg and Pignerol, the keys of Germany and Piedmont. *Sweden*,—a part of Pomerania, Bremen, Werden, Wismar, &c., three voices at the diet of the empire, and five millions of crowns. The *elector of Brandenburg*,—Magdeburg, Halberstadt, &c., &c. *Saxony*, *Mecklenburg*, and *Hesse-Cassel*, received also an indemnity. Fourthly, The son of Frederic V. recovered the lower palatinate of the Rhine (the higher palatinate remaining in the hands of Bavaria),—the eighth electoral dignity was

created in his favour. Fifthly, The Netherlands acknowledged independent of Spain, as well as of Germany, along with the Swiss cantons.

“To the empire,” says Coxe (*House of Austria*, v. i. p. 961), “as a great political body, this peace can appear scarcely in any other light than as a fatal blow to its strength and influence. The different states were, indeed, gratified with an appearance of independence, but purchased this shadow of sovereignty by foregoing the advantages derived from concord and union. The right which they acquired of concluding alliances with other states often rendered them the mere instruments of intrigue in the hands of foreign powers; and France in particular, by the assistance of the Germans themselves, erected and extended the ascendancy which she had gained by breaking down the barrier of the empire. To a few of the greater states the peace of Westphalia became the foundation of independence, but to the smaller it was the ultimate cause of weakness and degradation, and led to the subjugation of most of the imperial towns, once the chief seats of German wealth, prosperity, and commerce.”

The Christian societies of Europe have undergone a complete modification during the three centuries over which we have passed thus rapidly. The characteristic differences existing between the epoch of the peace of Westphalia and that of the Middle Ages are as profound, as real, as radical, as those which distinguish the twelfth century from the age of Charlemagne, or the Carolingian epoch from that of Constantine. A total change has taken place, not only in the general policy of Europe, in the social organisation, and in the institutions, but in the general manners and habits as well as in the ideas; it is the commencement of the social state which in the private relations of men is still existing. The treaty of Westphalia gave also a completely new direction to Europe by the new principles it consecrated, viz., the exclusion of the spiritual and religious interests from the European policy, and the principle of the absolute sovereignty of kings and princes over the countries which were submitted to them; in truth, each state con-

sidered itself as an independent whole, without any other object but its own preservation and its own aggrandisement : self-interest became the only law of international relations. The only interest capable of rallying the largest portion of Europe was the maintaining the *statu quo* ; and as the states were exceedingly unequal, the inferior ones were obliged to associate in order to arrest the over pre-eminence of any of the states of the first order ; thus the secondary states were thrown into the alliance of France at the end of the sixteenth century ; thus also the enemies of Austria united against that threatening empire during the thirty years' war ; and the same reasons became afterwards the bond of union of Europe against France when she became, through Richelieu and Louis XIV., a towering power. Those reasons became the germ of the principle of European equilibrium, of the balance of powers, which consists in the distribution of the territories, influence, and respective forces of the nations in such a manner that none may outstep the limits imposed. This principle had not yet received a clear formula, but it was in the spirit, in the intentions of all, and was practically applied whenever the circumstances permitted.

The balance of power being thus generally acknowledged, the theory came to sanction the facts established ; the rights of nations became defined, and grew into an international law. Hugo Grotius was the founder of the new moral science which, in the absence of religious principles, was to regulate the international relations. The rights and obligations of societies, with regard to each other, were deduced from the rights of individuals as to their life and self-preservation. Undoubtedly, the argument of superior material force remained the supreme law ; nevertheless, the theory was productive of many practical fruits : new forms were admitted in the diplomatic relations ; asperity in the communications between nations became altogether softened, and the horrors of war somewhat diminished ; a conventional right of nations, based upon the treaties and usages established, was founded, and the pacific relations were developed through the custom introduced, we believe, by Richelieu,

of having resident ambassadors in all the courts. Frequently their efforts and the diplomatic negotiations rendered a *casus belli* abortive, which might have caused the devastation of Europe.

The principle of the sovereignty of kings and princes being admitted, their solicitude was exclusively occupied by their external position, and did not introduce any internal ameliorations but those which could be of service to them in their European affairs and ambitions. Thus the military forces received a considerable increase; the permanent soldiery introduced since the fifteenth century became powerful armies in the seventeenth; new sources of power and of prosperity were also sought in industry, commerce, and colonies. Towards the close of the seventeenth century, the most fatal economical system was flourishing; wealth was confounded with the quantity of specie possessed. The object after which governments strained with the utmost efforts was to produce much, and sell to others without purchasing anything from them. In this view the exportation of specie and the importation of foreign goods were prohibited, while manufactures were created and national industry encouraged. For the same reason, every nation struggled for the possession of colonies, and after the example of Spain and Portugal they went in search of distant expeditions. Isolation and rivalry were the natural consequences of the tendencies of nations, while the European relations became singularly complicated; generally they were questions of equilibrium and of mercantile interests, or the caprice of a monarch, which called forth the sanguinary contests of nations.

Internally, the princes, as stated before, enjoyed an absolute power; the states-general, the municipal liberties, the guarantees of justice, all those institutions which had thrown so much vitality over the Middle Ages, had nearly all perished; England alone preserved them, and it cost her a cruel revolution. The princes did not take advantage of the great power they had been permitted to assume to hasten the progress of institutions; with very few exceptions the internal administra-

tion remained everywhere, under the yoke of confused, entangled, and innumerable formalities left from the preceding ages. In the heart of a nation, inequality and privileges would divide the provinces ; feudalism reigned in the civil laws ; unity had been acquired by the superior powers, but it had not penetrated into the social organisation. Although the nobility had ceased to be dangerous to the monarchs, it still trampled down with impunity the citizens and the peasants ; the nobles were in possession of most important privileges : they paid no taxes, they alone had access to the honours and high functions of the state, their pride had increased in proportion as their political influence had diminished, they no longer exercised any beneficent function whatever, they were merely a scourge in the state ; nevertheless, they could not enough scorn and insult the inferior races, whom they conceived they had a right to command and oppress. The veritable strength of the nation dwelt in the citizens and the people, although they were deprived of every political right, and subject to every burden. Unfortunately the *tiers-état* in France, by the new legislation on the corporation, had become gradually a class separate from the people ; royalty had acquired the right of granting the privilege of labour ; the number of members who could form part of the corporation of each trade was limited, and he who aspired to be admitted was obliged to submit to a long apprenticeship, and to purchase a *maîtrise* or guild ; he was, besides, to pay very high taxes to the king. Thus the products of industry became the privilege of a few, whilst, on the other hand, commerce on a large scale became a monopoly ; the custom was introduced to entrust all the great industrial undertakings, and especially the commerce of the colonies, to privileged companies ; such abuses were justified by the economical science of the times, and moreover the governments secured in this way a considerable share of the profits. With regard to the peasants, their fate was not much changed ; since the fourteenth century, serfdom had been abolished in France, modified in Italy and Spain, but it still existed in Germany, where a few

princes abolished it at the close of the eighteenth century. On the whole, the labouring classes were still in a wretched condition, and agriculture suffered from the oppression that weighed on the poor labourers ; wretched they were, indeed, and many are still so—but now, let us hope that there will be a period of regeneration for them, and they may expect that share of material comfort and moral and intellectual culture, to which they are entitled as members of a Christian community.

CHAPTER XI.

Fourth Period continued.—France.—Administration of Mazarin.—Louis XIV.—Character of his Reign.—Regency of the Duke of Orleans.—Corruption of Society.—External Policy of France.—Financial System of Law.—Louis XV.—His Ministers.—War of the Succession of Austria (1742-1748).—Scepticism.—Corruption.—Beaumarchais.—State of France.—Accession of Louis XVI. (1774).—His Character and Difficulties.—Turgot.—Necker.—States-General of 1789.—England.—Accession of Charles I. (1625).—Struggle between the King and Parliaments.—No Parliament from 1630 to 1638.—Hampden.—The King gives way, but too late.—Civil War.—Victories of Cromwell.—His Ascendancy.—Trial and Execution of Charles I. (1649).—Character of the Revolution.—Government of Cromwell.—His Death (1658).—Charles II. (1660).—James II. (1685).—Revolution of 1688.—William III. and Mary.—Progress of England.—Queen Anne (1702).—George I. (1714).—Walpole and Chatham.—Peace of Paris (1763).—American Insurrection (1773).—Progress of the English Constitution under Charles II., and after 1688.—The Netherlands.—Internal Dissensions.—The Armenians and Gommarists.—Barneveld (1619).—Prosperity of the Netherlands.—William of Orange.—Vicissitudes of Holland.—Germany.—Frederic III. (1637).—Leopold I. (1658).—Wars with France and Turkey.—Joseph I. (1705).—Charles VI. (1711).—War of Succession.—Prussia.—Maria Theresa.—Frederic II. of Prussia.—The Seven Years' War.—Joseph II. (1765).—Leopold II. (1790).—Spain, Italy, and Portugal.

FRANCE had been one of the great actors in the thirty years' war, and at the peace of Westphalia; we must now continue and terminate the summary of her political events. In the same year of that celebrated treaty broke out in Paris the burlesque revolution of the *Fronde* (Sling), a real childish tragico-comical war, which took its name from a toy: although comical in the events and principles, it was nevertheless the

last effort, the last combat, of the nobility supported by the parliament. The parliament assumed the authority of the states-general, and pretended to take a warm interest in the cause of the people, thus appearing suddenly in a new character; for hitherto it had ever been most docile, and it again became submissive under Louis XIV. The wretchedness of the people was extreme; a financial measure provoked a resistance on the part of the parliament. Mazarin endeavoured to strike a decisive blow; he ordered four of the counsellors to be arrested while the victory of Lens was celebrated at Nôtre Dame: it was the commencement of the insurrection; the oldest of the four counsellors, named Broussel, half imbecile, but whose white hair and frankness pleased the people, was the rallying name of the insurgents; a hundred thousand mouths called out for liberty and Broussel! for Broussel, or death! The court fled; the intrigues of the Fronde against the royal authority continued several years; they are illustrated by the name and memoirs of the Cardinal de Retz. Many sanguinary contests took place, and the greatest generals of France, Turenne and Condé, did not blush to serve in the Spanish ranks against their own country; but the skill, patience and perseverance of Mazarin triumphed; the nobility lost every vestige of political authority; that body remained, nevertheless, very wealthy, possessors of the largest portion of the territory, and separated from the bourgeoisie by a multitude of privileges; although, having lost all its former pretensions, it contented itself with the court favours: the royal authority was absolute.

The reign of Louis XIV. is justly celebrated in history. During his reign, France attained by her arms, her language, fine arts, literature, and industry, a superior degree of splendour. After innumerable struggles the moral unity of the nation was finally established, and every force, every intelligence, wasted hitherto in civil wars, was now put together to flourish, and it produced the fairest fruits; but although France had never been so great since Charlemagne, Louis did not share or understand the civilising power and faculties of

the immortal Carolingian ; he perfected that policy of personal ambition, of personal wars, commenced by Charles V. ; he rendered the noblest instruments, the fairest opportunities, subservient to his own egotistical principles and system of artificial civilisation. With an incontestable superiority of genius, Napoleon, with a very different origin, continued the same doctrines, the same personal ambition : he raised France to an equal degree of artificial splendour, but without its natural basis, its sole security, viz., the material, moral, and intellectual progress of the people along with the progress of liberty. And how did they both terminate ? Louis died abandoned by all, loathed by the people, his coffin insulted, and he left the country in the most abject state of misery ; Napoleon lingered, and expired solitary on the rock of St. Helena, having witnessed his dear and glorious France twice a prey to the barbarians of the North.

Louis identified himself with the state : he was the proudest of the proud Bourbons, and of an unbounded ambition ; he felt his own force and dignity, and long maintained in the ascendant the position of France ; but his vanity was also excessive, and it was quite enough for him to have his vanity satisfied ; social progress, therefore, was buried under the egotism of the monarch. The long reign of Louis XIV. is divided into two parts : the first, partly filled by the revered figure of Colbert, is glorious and splendid in every branch and every department ; the second, commencing with the eighteenth century, is celebrated especially for the endless disasters that befel France. The last moiety of the seventeenth century was the magnificent portion of that reign ; three fortunate wars aggrandised the territory of France : Flanders, Franche Comté, Strasbourg, and other points of minor importance, were conquered ; France was for a time the first nation in the world, and a frown from her great king might be said to make Europe tremble. The internal administration had attained in the hands of Colbert a degree of prosperity unknown before, the most perfect order was established in the financial affairs, and commerce as well as industry were rapidly developed,

being the objects of a special protection; the manufactures of Sedan, of Abbeville, of Louviers, of Lyons, and the royal manufactures of Sèvres, of the Gobelins, of St. Gobain, were founded; France was becoming the first manufacturing nation in Europe; the legislation of the maritime commerce was perfected, and the navy considerably augmented; colonial establishments had already been formed in Canada, Acadia, in several of the Antillas, at Cayenne, and the Senegal; the ancient possessions were wrought with more vigour, and new acquisitions annexed to them—principally, St. Domingo and Pondicherry; their trade was entrusted to privileged companies. Efforts were made to reform the civil and criminal legislation, and the sciences and fine arts were also the object of a munificence adequate to the lofty idea that Louis had formed of his own royal power. France was establishing her superiority over Europe, through her intellectual development as well as by her arms.

However, towards the close of the seventeenth century, commenced the decline of the reign of Louis XIV.: all the great men who had made its glory disappeared successively; long and tedious quarrels arose between the king and the court of Rome; then came the discussions between the Jesuits and the Jansenists. Louis, grown old, satiated with all earthly pomp and enjoyments, became a cruel bigot: he allowed the celebrated Madame de Maintenon to exercise an unbounded control over him, and with her he plunged into the mystical devotion of the Jesuits—and the fatal consequence of such aberrations was the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and the persecutions against the Protestants (1685). The edict of Nantes being annulled, was at once an outrageous iniquity and a gross imbecility; it deprived France of a whole population of skilful workmen and manufacturers, and transplanted to a foreign land the best portion of the industry of the nation; and all those who were thus obliged to leave their native country were peaceful citizens, totally strangers to politics, since the days of Richelieu. Since Colbert's death the financial difficulties had increased, the treasury was ex-

hausted by the war and the prodigalities of the court ; the progress of industry and of manufactures could not compensate for the total absence of political progress, which the nation had the right to expect from a royal authority so great and so powerful as that of Louis XIV. ; he never once gave attention to the subject ; not once, probably, did it flash across his selfish mind ; on the contrary, his despotism was daily heavier, and he allowed serfdom to subsist in several localities lately annexed to France. The campaigns of the first part of Louis's reign had been illustrated by great victories gained by his illustrious generals. But already the war of the English succession against William III. had been an exhausting struggle, despite the victories of Luxembourg ; it terminated, however, honourably by the treaty of Ryswick (1698), and now Louis accepted the succession of the throne of Spain for his grandson (1700).

The war of the succession of Spain commenced by the victories of Vendome, Catinat, and Villars. But, afterwards, when Prince Eugene and the duke of Marlborough had the command, it became disastrous for France ; their successive triumphs opened to them the gates of the kingdom. They entered Provence and Flanders (1707, 1708). The year 1709 was a terrible one : the winter mortally severe ; besides which a famine came ; wretchedness reigned everywhere. The valets of the king were obliged to beg at the gates of the palace of Versailles. The great monarch and Madame de Maintenon were reduced to eat brown bread. No specie and no credit to be found. Whole companies of soldiers, not being paid, deserted and plundered the country. The peasants were tracked like wild beasts, and new arbitrary taxes imposed. The war continued the following years, still disastrous for the old king ; finally, Villars, by his victory of Denain, saved France (1712), and soon after was signed the Peace of Utrecht, by which, strange to say, she did not lose a single province, notwithstanding so many misfortunes. Louis XIV. did not survive it long ; he died (1715), having seen, in a few years, all his children and grandchildren precede him to the

tomb. All that had been left latterly in the vast palace of Versailles was the old king and a child five years old, now Louis XV.

Whilst the mortal remains of Louis XIV. were taken solitary to St. Denis, the duke of Orleans induced the parliament to annul the will of the king, assumed the regency, and plunged into a career, policy, and manners, that formed the completest contrast with the preceding reign. The princes of the blood, courtiers, parliaments, Jansenists, all raised their heads and gave way to every license. A torrent of licentiousness and the grossest depravity invaded France; the nobility gave to the people the example of a most hideous corruption; and the palace of the regent became the centre of every debauchery. In the meantime was seen the dawn of the scepticism and incredulity of the eighteenth century. Voltaire was making his appearance, and he attacked indiscriminately all tenets, every dogma and morality, led on by his ardour in levelling mortal blows on the detestable institutions, the excessive hypocrisy and revolting abuses then existing.

The history of the regency of the duke of Orleans is especially remarkable by two facts:—the first was the change of the external policy of France. The greatest influence was then exercised by the infamous minister, Cardinal Dubois, whom the regent called his *rogue*, and in whose hands he, nevertheless, left the reins of government. Dubois gave up the Spanish alliance, the constant object of the efforts of Louis XIV., and sought the friendship of the old rival of France—of England. Spain then became the common enemy of both. The Spanish minister, Alberoni, formed a vast conspiracy of restorations: he intended to give the regency of France to Philip V.; to place the Pretender on the English throne: he fixed his eyes on Charles XII. of Sweden as the best instrument for his views. But this vast European scheme failed: Charles XII. was killed, the Pretender's pretensions proved abortive, and the Spanish ambassador was arrested in Paris in the midst of his intrigues. France, England, Holland, and

the emperor, formed a quadruple alliance against Alberoni and Spain (1718).

The other great fact of the regency was a financial operation: a Scotchman, Law, obtained, in 1716, permission to open a bank. He substituted paper-money for specie: these bills circulated widely. It was credit established on a large scale for the first time; the regent, amazed, put all the resources of the state into his hands; there was issued paper-money to an unlimited amount on the security of the taxes of the kingdom, and of all the colonies. The company of the Mississippi was created. Gold was rejected. The value of the paper-money increased every day—every hour. Exchange and speculation became a frenzy. But the confidence in the paper began to be shaken. Incredulity, terror, suddenly seized all the bondholders: a general rush took place to get specie in place of the paper, and violent measures were taken to check the overpowering demands. At last, a large portion of the bills and bonds were annulled. This financial revolution engendered marvellous changes: the rich became poor,—the poor rich. Fortune which hitherto was held by the land, and was immovable in families, for the first time changed hands, was dispersed, and prepared to penetrate into commerce and industry. An analogous movement took place over the whole of Europe. The great innovation of Law has erroneously been considered in a financial point of view exclusively; whilst it was imbued with a great social object, which was to detach human mind from the sordid, exclusive bonds that held it to the soil—to diffuse property with more equity, to open a new source of product, and to establish credit, which, in itself, is wealth. Law has a legitimate claim to the honour of having also prepared, however indirectly, the magnificent revolutionary movement of 1789.

After the regency came the reign of Louis XV., still more fatal and disgraceful. During the first year of his reign, the government remained in the hands of the duke of Orleans, then in those of the incapable duke of Bourbon (1723-1726),

who was replaced by the old and prudent Fleury, who faithfully adhered to the peace system, followed also in England by Robert Walpole. Fleury paid exclusive attention to the internal administration of the kingdom. In 1720, acquisition had been made of the isles of France and Bourbon, and those French colonies were yet flourishing. A court intrigue placed on the throne of France, as consort of Louis XV., the daughter of Leczinski, who had been made king of Poland by Charles XII., and who, now dethroned, lived in France. In 1733, that throne being vacant, Leczinski collected more than 63,000 suffrages : he had the sympathies of France, but needed her support. Fleury abandoned him as well as Poland, although obliged to carry on the war in Italy, because Spain had declared herself in favour of Leczinski against Austria, and had assumed this pretence to recover her Italian possessions. Nevertheless, by the treaty of Vienna (1738), France made the acquisition of Lorraine, and placed an ally, the Infant Don Carlos, on the throne of the Two Sicilies.

Fleury beheld, before his death, the commencement of the war of the succession of Austria (1741-1748). The interference of France in this war was the result of private ambition and intrigue: the humiliation of the old rival was one of the objects. Although the French arms were often successful in this long and confused contest, nevertheless France did not derive any advantages from it ; on the contrary, her navy was destroyed, her colonies ruined ; and at the close of the war, by the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, France, England and Holland restored to each other their conquests in Europe and in the two Indies. Moreover, the *Pragmatic Sanction* of Charles VI., the succession of the house of Hanover in England and Germany, and the possession of Silesia by the king of Prussia, were confirmed and guaranteed.

Louis XV. gave the promise of a moral life at the commencement of his reign, but the depraved atmosphere of the court assailed him ; and he breathed corruption to such a degree, that his name has remained associated with every infamy. Indifferent, effeminate, voluptuous,

Louis considered France as a mere instrument made for his pleasures; he was the promoter of the fearful immorality that exercised its pestiferous ravages in all the higher classes of society during the eighteenth century. The gravest affairs of the government were at the mercy of degraded women; during his reign, peace and war were often decided by the caprice of a prostitute. In the midst of such a policy, the seven years' war broke out, and it terminated disastrously for France. We will cast a glance upon it when dwelling on the Germanic affairs. France lost Senegal, Louisiana, and, above all, the Canadas. The only able minister of the time, the duke of Choiseul, made the greatest efforts to restore to France some of her former dignity; it was all in vain. He was the author of the famous *Pacte de Famille* (family compact), or alliance, between the reigning members of the house of Bourbon. The court of Versailles baffled all his measures. The only acquisition of this period was the island of Corsica, formerly possessed by Genoa; it had revolted, was purchased by Choiseul, and annexed to France after a short resistance.

While the nobles who surrounded the throne were sullyng their historical names by the vilest corruption, the effervescence of a philosophical scepticism had penetrated into every class of society. The honest voice of Rousseau, appealing to nature and morality and spiritualism—despite the blots which sadly impair his life and works—was overpowered by incessant volleys of sarcasms. France seemed in a state of delirium. The abasement, corruption and misery then reigning could not be surpassed; and at this epoch appeared the *Memoirs of Beaumarchais*, and an hysterical, inextinguishable laughter resounded in the whole kingdom. The Jesuits had been banished; the spirited minister, Choiseul, was exiled for not bending before one of the abject creatures of the king. A shadow of opposition to the sovereignty of prostitution was offered by the parliaments; their dissolution was ordered, the magistrates exiled, and the nation fell into the tranquillity of passiveness. The despotism of the courtiers resumed its excesses. Malversation and arbitrary measures extended more and more.

For instance, the *lettres de cachet*, orders ready signed, to dispatch any one in the dark dungeons of the Bastille, without appeal or trial, became daily in greater usage; they could be purchased, and were a useful instrument to put an end to private enmities. Nothing could be more deplorable than the state of the finances; the yearly expenditure and yearly deficit were frightful. A host of corrupt and greedy courtiers were devouring the public fortune, and an infamous speculation in corn, in which royalty itself took part, condemned the laborious classes to utter destitution. The people stigmatised this abominable traffic by the name of *Pacte de Famine* (the famine compact).

Such was the state of France when the unfortunate Louis XVI. ascended the throne (1774). If the physical sufferings of the nation were great, as it may be seen, even from the few words we have said, her moral sufferings were still more acute. The nation was sensible of her being a Christian nation; the people, in their anguish, turned to the precepts of Christianity, however much they might afterwards adapt them to their own passions; and France, a Christian nation, was bending under the yoke of disgusting courtiers! Such an unheard-of despotism, contrary to all the national traditions—to all the principles of liberty and equality taught by Christianity—could not be tolerated. The sceptic philosophy of the eighteenth century, on the other hand, had produced bitter fruits: an exaggerated contempt for all ancient institutions was manifest among another portion of the nation; there was in the hearts of all, however, a hope for better laws—a general yearning for a social revolution. This revolution was inevitable. The character of Louis XVI. is well known. He was amiable, honourable, well-disposed, a highly moral man, but excessively weak. He heard the universal cry for reform, and he called to the administration one of the most illustrious men of the age—the generous, the great Turgot, who commenced, without loss of time, with energy, the mighty work of a reform—of curing a leprosy that seemed incurable. But the queen and court intrigues surrounded the feeble monarch, who

yielded to them, and he dismissed Turgot—a guilty, a criminal weakness, which cannot be softened by any argument; for Louis had said that in the whole of France there was only himself and Turgot who loved the people! The king now tried a financial minister; he called Necker, who, although void of the lofty principles and ideas of Turgot, nevertheless repaired some of the grossest abuses, that were a disgrace to the country; but, he fell also. The public voice became menacing. The propositions of the court party were rejected with scorn. The parliaments earnestly took in hand the cause of the people. The king recalled Necker, and the convocation of the states-general was decided. They opened on the 5th May 1789. For the first time, the *tiers-état* appeared on a footing of equality with the two other bodies. Hitherto, France had only seen those two bodies—the nobility and the clergy; and the poor people had been left far below, in darkness, and accustomed to suffer and to pay. Now, a portion of the people, namely, the *tiers-état*, felt their rights, and declared, that if the two privileged bodies refused to join them, they alone could represent the nation. The states-general of 1789 legalised the revolution.

England had offered the spectacle of a royal authority almost absolute under the Tudors. James I. had also tended to render his power as omnipotent as that of the other states of Europe; but the public opinion had undergone an entire revolution on those topics, and it was the lot of Charles I. to mount the throne at that period (1625), and yet to retain exaggerated ideas of his royal prerogatives. He first quarrelled with his parliament, on their refusal of adequate supplies for the war in support of the elector palatine. The king dissolved that parliament. A new parliament was found equally uncomplying, and even impeached his favourite, the hated Buckingham. Charles avenged the insult by imprisoning two members of the house of commons. To this he added many new causes of offence. The levying money from the subject was enforced by billeting soldiers on those who refused to lend to the crown; and some were imprisoned on that ac-

count. The war undertaken against France, at Buckingham's instigation, proving fruitless, added to the general dissatisfaction. Charles again dissolved this parliament (1626). A new parliament exhibited a spirit of determined reformation. A *petition of rights* was passed by both houses, which declared the illegality of raising money without their sanction, or enforcing loans from the subject: it annulled all taxes imposed without the consent of parliament, and abolished the exercise of martial law. Charles was obliged, with much reluctance, to give his assent to this retrenchment of his prerogatives.

The king conceived, also, that he was warranted to levy the taxes of tonnage and poundage without a new grant, and a member of the house of commons was imprisoned on refusing to pay them. This arbitrary measure excited a violent ferment in that assembly, and the consequence was, another dissolution of the parliament (1629). Charles, seeing all his demands rejected, made peace with France and with Spain, and endeavoured to govern without convoking a parliament at all (1630-1638). Then, the queen and the ministers on one side, and the court and the council on the other, vied with each other as to the exercise of despotism. Strafford and Archbishop Laud instituted the most violent measures; monopolies were sold; illegal taxes were defended by corrupt tribunals and judges; arbitrary and enormous fines were imposed by authority of the Star Chamber. The government, not supported by the higher aristocracy, had recourse to the clergy, who gradually invaded the civil authority. The nonconformists were cruelly persecuted: a multitude of men, who could no longer tolerate such an odious oppression, emigrated to America. The public indignation exploded when John Hampden, refusing to pay the tax of ship-money, which he considered illegal, was tried and condemned by the Court of Exchequer, contrary to justice, and to the laws of the realm.

Another grievous source of discontent was, an imprudent attempt to introduce the liturgy of the Church of England among the Scots: violent commotions followed, and a bond, termed the *National Covenant*, containing an oath of resistance

to all religious innovations, was subscribed in Scotland, by all ranks and conditions. In a general assembly at Glasgow (1638), the episcopal hierarchy was solemnly abolished. The Scotch reformers took up arms, and marched into the heart of England. Richelieu aided them. The king saw that it was absolutely necessary to assemble a parliament, and to give way to the irresistible torrent of public opinion; but it was too late. A bill, however, passed, abolishing the tonnage and poundage without consent of parliament. Monopolies of every description were abolished. The earl of Strafford, the king's first minister, together with Laud, were impeached of high treason, and both beheaded. The commons afterwards obtained the king's consent to a decisive measure—a bill which rendered the parliament perpetual, by declaring that it should not be dissolved or adjourned but by its own decree (1641). The Irish Catholics attempted to massacre all the Protestants in Ireland. Charles consigned to parliament the care of the war; and he saw, with feelings of bitterness, that body assume the whole military power of the crown. His indignation exploded at last on a remonstrance of the commons. He ordered five members to be arrested, and went in person to the house to seize them. He failed in this *coup d'état*, which was an outrageous breach of the privilege of parliament. Now, the contest could only be decided by the sword. The king left London to commence the civil war (11th January 1642).

The parliamentary party had the advantage of number; they had on their side, the metropolis, the great cities, the harbours, and the fleet; and were, above all, animated by a burning enthusiasm. The king was followed by most of the nobility; his adherents prevailed in the counties of the north and west, while the partisans of parliament had the almost unanimous support of the richest and most thickly inhabited counties—those of the east, of the centre, and south-east. The king advanced towards the metropolis, but the battle of Edge-Hill saved the parliamentary party: it gave them time to organise themselves. Numerous squadrons were formed in which religious exaltation was opposed to the chivalrous

spirit of the cavaliers. The parliament gained a decisive victory at Newbury, and entered into a confederacy with Scotland, by a new bond, or *solemn league and covenant* (1643). The parliamentary army was commanded by Cromwell and Fairfax. The enthusiasm was excessive, and the royalists were defeated at Marston Moor, after an obstinate struggle. The king lost York and all the north. The queen fled to France (1644). The disaster, however, seemed repaired during a short time; the king had forced the parliamentary general Essex to capitulate in Cornwall, and in Scotland the royal cause was gallantly sustained by the Marquis of Montrose. But the valour of Oliver Cromwell and his army made the cause of the parliament triumph at Newbury again, and at Naseby. After the defeat of Naseby, the king's troops were entirely dispersed, and he threw himself into the hands of the Scots, who delivered him up to the commissioners of parliament. His papers, found after the victory, and read publicly in London, proved that, notwithstanding his thousand times repeated protestations, he was inviting foreign aid, and especially the Irish Catholics.

Charles, now a prisoner, became an instrument in the hands of the army, and of the parliament, who were at variance; he was carried away from the place where he was guarded by the commissaries of parliament, and Cromwell, on his own authority, had him brought to the army. A reaction, however, was taking place in favour of the king; a body of men forced the parliament to vote the return of the king, but Cromwell and the army entered London, and he assumed absolute control. Cromwell hesitated whether he should not prepare the restoration of the king. He soon found, however, that no reliance could be placed upon Charles, and he had abundant proofs of his insincerity and projected treachery; he therefore began to aim at something higher. There had always been in the parliamentary party some men whose minds were set on objects from which the majority of that party would have shrunk with horror. These men were, in religion, Independents. They conceived

that every Christian congregation had supreme jurisdiction in things spiritual. In politics, they were what we now call Radicals. Cromwell placed himself at the head of the Independents, became the soul of the party, and sought to obtain absolute possession of the person of the king. The latter fled to the Isle of Wight, but was there detained a prisoner. The parliament, wishing to escape military anarchy, were now sincerely desirous of terminating this state of disorder by a treaty with the king; and after a long negotiation, the terms seemed adjusted, when the army had him carried away from the Isle of Wight, and *purged* the parliament. The house of commons was surrounded, and all the members who claimed their rights were violently excluded, the partisans of Cromwell alone being admitted; then, a vote was passed declaring it treason in a king to levy war against his parliament, and a court of justice was appointed to try the king for this act of treason. The house of lords having rejected this decree, they were declared a useless branch of the constitution. Charles was therefore brought to trial, and condemned to suffer death. His head fell on the block on the 30th January 1649.

This revolution and Oliver Cromwell are distinguished by a character essentially religious. The similarity that has been seen between the English revolution and that of France seems to us more imaginary than real. The latter was a general fact; it certainly was in its origin a development of the social principles of Christianity, and remains the greatest era of European progress. The revolution of England, on the contrary, was of no avail to humanity, and affected England only. The political question was effaced by the religious question. It was a struggle for individual liberty, but still more for the triumph of Calvinism. It was the echo of the religious discussion that had agitated Europe during the preceding age. The theological quarrels having penetrated into the middle class of English society, and introduced a superabundance of biblical reading and contemplation, scriptural conversations, and prayers mixed with almost

every public and private action; they engendered a sombre fanaticism, and that high degree of religious exaltation, eternal source of great deeds. Cromwell, with his deep religious convictions, thinking himself a saint, animated by divine inspiration, was their natural chief and representative. His military genius, talents for administration, as well as his ambition and great prudence, brought him inevitably on the first rank, and triumph was ensured to the revolution. Never could the levity, indifference, and sceptic bravery of the royalists have trampled down those stern bands with their souls of adamant. And their king, moreover, void of those principles of honour which command devotedness and inspire a moral enthusiasm, proved himself sadly in harmony with the defenders of the royal cause. Indeed, it was a struggle between ascetic, mystical, rugged virtue, and elegant hereditary vice: between royal hypocrisy, with republican, earnest faith. "We will premise," says Mr. Macaulay, "that we think worse of King Charles I. than even Mr. Hallam appears to do. The fixed hatred of liberty which was the principle of the king's public conduct, the unscrupulousness with which he adopted any means which might enable him to attain his ends, the readiness with which he gave promises, the impudence with which he broke them, the cruel indifference with which he threw away his useless and damaged tools, made him, at least till his character was fully exposed, and his power shaken to its foundations, a more dangerous enemy to the constitution than a man of far greater talents and resolution might have been. Such princes may still be seen, the scandals of the southern thrones of Europe; princes false alike to the accomplices who have served them, and to the opponents who have spared them; princes who, in the hour of danger, concede everything, swear everything, hold out their cheeks to every smiter, give up to punishment every instrument of their tyranny, and await with meek and smiling implacability the blessed day of perjury and revenge."

Cromwell annihilated the insurrections in favour of the son of the beheaded king. He defeated the Scotch at Dunbar;

and, following the royal army, he cut them to pieces in the decisive battle of Worcester (1651). Poor Ireland was trampled under foot; her religion violently oppressed, and subject to the most iniquitous spoliations. In the external relations, the republican Parliament formed and exercised great designs. A war with Holland was gloriously maintained, during which the English took above sixteen hundred of the Dutch ships: in the meantime a great change took place again in the interior. The parliament seemed determined to reduce the land army. To prevent this, Cromwell framed a remonstrance of the army; and this meeting with no regard, he entered the house of commons, which he had surrounded with his troops, and, declaring the parliament dissolved by his authority, forcibly turned the members out of doors. A parliament, however, must exist; and he selected about sixty of his partisans, to hold their functions for fifteen months. This parliament (*Barebones*) was also dissolved after five months; and the officers of the army proclaimed a new constitution, with Cromwell protector of the three kingdoms. He became king in all but the name. His administration was honest, vigorous and highly spirited; he maintained the honour of the nation with energy and skill. He compelled the Dutch to bow down before the English flag. He was successful in his negotiations with France and Spain. The kings of Europe feared him and sought his alliance; and when he died (1658), he left his country in a commanding and prosperous position.

Richard Cromwell succeeded his father for a few months; utterly unfit to govern, and to conciliate the parliament and the army, he resigned; his brother Henry, viceroy of Ireland, followed his example, and the family of the Cromwells returned to obscurity. Intrigue, cabal and anarchy became universal. General Monk appeared as a mediator; he marched into England with his army; and, having assembled a free parliament, he restored royalty; Charles II. was recalled (1660). Now commences another of those re-actions that so often sully the pages of history. To the austere, energetic, reli-

gious reign of Cromwell, succeeded the orgies and base cruelties of the new king. Religious persecutions were commenced both in Scotland and England. Charles II. had inherited the unprincipled despotic tendencies of his father; but he was something more—he was the very incarnation of profligacy. His popularity was not of a long duration. An unsuccessful war with the Dutch, his alliance with France, the sale of Dunkirk, and the refusal of his brother, the duke of York, to take the test oath abjuring Popery, called forth clamorous complaints from every quarter. The nation manifested great irritation. Then became first known the two epithets of *Whig* and *Tory*; the former opposers of the crown, the liberal party, insisting on the bill for the exclusion of the duke of York from the succession to the throne; and the latter being the partisans of the crown, and of the exclusive principle of the legitimacy of princes.* The king, sure of the support of France, and ruffled by the predominance of the Whigs in parliament, dissolved it, and found the succeeding one equally firm and hostile; a dissolution ensued again, and Charles governed without a parliament. Immortal patriots, headed by Russell and Sydney, strained to vindicate the national liberties. A great scheme of insurrection was formed, and also a plot of assassination by a few desperate men: the conspiracy was detected, and Russell and Sydney, implicated in the whole, were condemned, in defiance of law and justice, and suffered capital punishment. The royal authority remained absolute, and began again to violate the letter of the law. New inroads were made in the constitution.

In 1685, the duke of York succeeded his brother by the title of James II. He ran headlong to destruction. He made a desperate attempt to substitute the Roman faith in room of the Protestant. All opposition—every conspiracy were drowned in blood. Merciless judges, among whom the ferocity of a Jeffreys has remained celebrated, seemed to ensure the success of the royal cause. Public indigna-

* See Appendix, No. IX. (a.)

tion augmented rapidly. Tories and Whigs united in opposition to the crown, and their views rested on the king's son-in-law, William of Orange, Stadtholder of the Dutch United States. But the expectations of William seemed baffled by the birth of a son to James II. He was ambitious to govern England, in order to arm her against hated France. The infatuation of the king, however, and the discontent of the nation, were such, that William received pressing invitations to come to England, and he landed with an army, and entered London without opposition (1688). Thus ended this new English revolution. William being declared sovereign jointly with his consort, Princess Mary, James's eldest daughter, consolidated his power by giving satisfaction to all the wishes of the opposition. The Catholic posterity of James was declared for ever excluded from the throne. England now entered fully into the development of her constitution. Whigs and Tories rallied round the new royalty; but they continued to exist; the former, supporting the liberal ideas of the age, defenders of individual rights and interests; the latter, long representing the higher aristocracy, supporters of the doctrines of legitimacy—of the English church and of a general *statu quo* in the state. The struggle between the two parties has always continued—often with virulence—constantly with a warm animosity. But the questions agitated among them have never been real questions of principles, nor have they been divided by any great practical distinctions. The ground-work of all the discussions and rivalries between Whigs and Tories have, seldom (if ever) been anything but questions of ministerial power; and, when an opposition had attained that power, it invariably followed the same line of conduct as their rivals. That rivalry added to the royal authority and impaired the progress of the constitution. No social reform, no progressive modifications, were introduced: the aristocracy preserved the same extensive authority and influence; and a pure spirit of feudalism continued in the electoral system, in the municipal institutions and the civil laws.

With reference to the external relations of England, the

constitution exercised, we may say, neither power nor influence. The national spirit has ever been all in all, and has generally allowed the government an absolute power of action. The commercial genius of England commenced a magnificent career, which terminated in her domination of the seas and commercial supremacy. Elizabeth and Cromwell had given the impulse. It was followed by William III. and his successors. Already, at the close of the sixteenth century, establishments had been formed in India and on the coasts of America. Subsequently came the acquisition of the Antillas, of Jamaica, and of St. Helena (1651). The commercial relations assumed a great extension. Numerous emigrations, caused by the first Revolution, and by the Restoration, gradually peopled the colonies of North America. Towards the close of the seventeenth century all the coasts from Louisiana to Canada were occupied by a population purely English, and divided in States, governed after the democratical principles of the revolution.

William III., who had the support of the Whigs, founded his continental policy on an alliance with Austria and the Netherlands against France. The government of Queen Anne (1702-1714) continued the same political principles during the war of the succession of Spain. The peace of Utrecht was only rendered possible by the fall of the Whig administration of the duke of Marlborough. This peace added much to the colonies of England, and to her commercial advantages.

At the accession of George I. (1714), a Whig administration resumed the reins of government; and, under the Regent and Dubois, France submitted to the English ascendancy. Robert Walpole, minister from 1721 to 1742, had for his chief object, to preserve the European peace and ameliorate the internal administration. No means of corruption were spared to attain that object, thanks to a venal parliament. The opposition was headed by William Pitt (Lord Chatham), the illustrious representative of British honour and British glory. Walpole was obliged to declare war against Spain, and when the death

of the emperor Charles VI., had rendered a universal warfare unavoidable, he was obliged to quit the administration. Soon after, Pitt took up the reins of government, and during the seven years' war, he held them with unparalleled vigour and without check. His administration is one of the most glorious epochs of the history of England. His martial policy and aversion against France long debarred him from any tendency to peace; at last he concluded the peace of Paris (1763), by which England acquired Canada, the Floridas and Senegal. The English navy had no rival.

But the English pretensions in the colonies were exciting the indignation of all the other nations; pretensions and despotic tendencies assailed the North American States, which refused to recognise in the English parliament the right of taxing them without their consent. The English government resisted, and the insurrection broke out at Boston (1773). The war of independence followed, and the pure, lofty figure of Washington appears in the sacred struggle. Louis XVI. aided the Americans; and thus seemed to send for that spirit and those weapons that were soon after to hurl him from the throne to the scaffold. By the peace of 1783, Great Britain recognised the independence of the United States of America. England could well sustain the loss, and permit the formation of another powerful Christian state, for the conquests of the British armies in India have extended immeasurably; their history forms a vast subject, replete with dramatic vicissitudes, and worthy of the deepest moral reflections. England seems destined to take a pre-eminent part in the propagation of Christian civilisation, and it is to be hoped that she will fulfil her mission with Christian zeal and integrity.

We have stated that Charles I. had attempted to revive some enormities which had been dormant in the reign of King James. He was compelled to sign the *Petition of Rights*, enacted to abolish these encroachments, and by it the English constitution received great alteration and improvement. The royal abuses, nevertheless, were most oppressive; the crown revived the latent power of the forest laws; the jurisdiction

of the star-chamber and high commission courts was extremely great; yet their usurped authority was still greater; the proceedings of the ecclesiastical governors in matters of mere indifference were intolerably despotic; and the levies of tonnage and poundage, ship-money, and other projects, were all iniquitous and arbitrary. Redress was sought in a legal, constitutional way, and this redress was given. But, unfortunately, the king's want of sincerity had become notorious; the majority of the nation understood, and it has been clearly proved since, that Charles's condescension was merely temporary; his rash actions and unguarded expressions confirmed the suspicion of his hypocrisy, and the monarchy was deliberately, solemnly overturned.

In the person of Charles II. the regal government was restored, and with it the ancient constitution. His reign—wicked, turbulent, sanguinary as it was,—may be considered, nevertheless, as the date of the complete restitution of English liberty. Strange anomaly! While the English sceptre was held by the hands of that corrupt and despotic monarch—not only the slavish tenures, the badge of foreign dominion, with all their oppressive appendages, were removed from incumbering the estates of the subject; but also an additional security of his person from imprisonment was obtained, by that great bulwark of the English constitution, the *habeas corpus* act. These two statutes, with regard to property and persons, form a second *magna charta*, as beneficial and effectual as that of Runnymede. They extirpated all the slaveries of the feudal system, except perhaps in copyhold tenure; and there also they are now, in a great measure, modified by gradual custom, and the interposition of the courts of justice. To that progression in the English constitution must be added the abolition of the prerogatives of purveyance and pre-emption,—the introduction of the statute for holding triennial parliaments,—of the test and corporation acts, which secure both the civil and religious liberties of England; and the abolition of the writ *de hæretico comburendo*. The statute of frauds and perjuries, a great and necessary

security to private property; the statute for distribution of intestate estates, besides many other wholesome acts, were also passed in this reign. And yet this reign beheld the most iniquitous proceedings, contrary to all law, through the artifice of wicked and unprincipled politicians, both in and out of office. But the nation could not be enslaved, and Charles's brother found that the people could and would resist and baffle the efforts of tyranny.

After the Revolution of 1688, the liberties of England have been asserted in more clear and emphatic terms by the laws which have passed:—such as the bill of rights, the toleration act, the act of settlement, with its conditions, the act uniting England with Scotland, and several others. Other laws have also passed, regulating the succession of the crown, confirming the doctrine of resistance, maintaining the superiority of the laws above the king, restraining the king's pardon from obstructing parliamentary impeachments, &c., &c. The progress of English liberty offers the noblest spectacle in history. It has continued with majestic grandeur in our time. Among the contemporary instances of political progress, it suffices to mention the act emancipating the Roman Catholic subjects from disabilities,—the prohibition of slavery throughout the British empire,—the act of municipal reform,—the law amendment act,—the remarkable improvements of the criminal law,—finally, the reform bill, and the extraordinary advancement of free-trade principles. Thus, in contemplating the past, the people of England may justly await the future, with patience and security; the necessity of social reforms, of a greater practical working of the principles of Christianity, is felt by all. They will not and cannot be deceived.

The United Provinces of the Netherlands—that new republic formed in the midst of the European monarchies—rapidly attained a degree of splendid prosperity, but its decline was almost as rapid as its elevation—and its brief existence became an unfortunate exemplification of pure republicanism; yet its form of government and administration we believe to

have contributed in no degree to that decline which followed a momentary greatness. The moral law which presides over nations is this—that all states whose *only* basis of greatness consists in an extensive industry and commerce stand over a hollow foundation, and can only offer instances of ephemeral grandeur.

We have spoken of the truce of twelve years concluded with Spain in 1609. The war was renewed in 1621, and continued until the treaty of Westphalia. During this contest, the navy of the Dutch maintained continually a great superiority, while Spain lost many of her colonies. The united provinces had no longer to fear for their independence. Spain was obliged to treat with her former subjects on a footing of equality.

But civil dissensions broke out in the new republic. Being divided in seven different states, each of which possessed a private government with provincial assemblies, no great spirit of unity could prevail. The nobility and the cities alone were admitted to vote in the provincial states. In Friesland only, the peasants who were proprietors had the privilege of voting. Each state had one voice in the states-general, the sovereign and legislative assembly. The common administration, the financial department, and the army, were entrusted to a senate composed of twelve members. The great question to be resolved was, whether the supreme authority of one individual could be established on a firm basis. During the storms of the insurrection, William of Orange had been invested with the function of stadtholder (governor-general), as we have seen; but he had undoubtedly hoped to render that dignity the patrimony of his family. After his death, however, the states offered it to several foreign princes; finally, Maurice, William's son, obtained possession of the reins of government. There was a strong opposition in the states of Holland against such monarchical tendencies. The contest commenced, but it assumed and preserved the external form of a theological warfare. Arminius, professor of divinity at Leyden, defended the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination,

and was openly attacked by his colleague, Professor Gomar. Arminius replied, and thus commenced a dispute which has not yet subsided. This controversy took hold of the public sympathies. The contest went on until all Holland was in a state of religious war. Barneveldt, the grand pensionary, the high-minded patriot, who had been the means of extorting from the Spanish court a recognition of the independence of the united provinces as a preliminary condition to all negotiation, was in Holland the representative of the peace party and of the civil power, while Maurice, the stadtholder and commander-in-chief, was the head of the war and military party. Barneveldt, in order to procure liberty of conscience throughout the provinces, openly protected the *Arminians*, although himself somewhat opposed to their doctrines. Prince Maurice, on the other hand, lent all his aid to the *Gomarists*, knowing that they were the more numerous and powerful party. After a struggle of ten years, Maurice triumphed over Barneveldt, as well as the states, and usurped the sovereign power. The army was devoted to him, and every artifice of fraud and misrepresentation was employed to hold up the patriot party to popular odium. The grand pensionary, despite his zeal, admirable administration, and purity, was exposed to the vilest attacks and foulest calumnies. He opposed the calling a national synod, as dangerous to the internal peace, but was defeated by his enemies. The point at issue was, whether every form of religion should be tolerated in the states. Barneveldt was the noble champion of toleration. He appealed to former declarations, which openly tolerated all forms of worship in all the states. He induced the states to act upon his views; great disturbances followed, and Maurice, instead of aiding the civil authorities in suppressing them, encouraged the confusion. In this embarrassment, Barneveldt formed a militia, and Maurice immediately marched his army against them, disarmed them, and openly assumed absolute authority. Previous to this, Barneveldt had been arrested. A trial soon followed. All the charges brought against him were vague and frivolous; he easily refuted them

triumphantly ; nevertheless he was found guilty, among other things, for "having brought the church of God into trouble," and sentenced to death—and that greatest and best of the citizens of Holland was beheaded, meeting his fate with that calm courage which attended him through life (May 14th, 1619).

The family of Orange kept possession of the stadtholderate under Maurice ; after him, under his brother, Frederick-Henry, and William II., son of the latter. But when William II. died, leaving a son a minor, the opposition triumphed ;—the general stadtholderate was abolished (1650). By this revolution, Holland recovered the management of her own affairs, when great wealth and commercial activity had given to that country a superior preponderance. The direction of the affairs was entrusted to the *grand pensionary*, who presided over the provincial states, and who took the initiative in the council of administration. Although he was only elected for five years, and had not the power of voting, yet his influence was extensive ; and when John de Witt was elevated to this function, he governed the whole confederation, which, under his government, attained a surpassing degree of prosperity. The northern states, as well as Belgium, had long been celebrated for their industry and commerce ; the war of independence developed among them a singular spirit of adventure ; the voyages to India were multiplied ; the harbour of Lisbon being closed, the Hollanders were obliged to go and seek themselves the colonial products in distant lands. Soon after the celebrated Indian Company was formed (1602), and by a severe administration derived abundant fruits from the exclusive privilege it possessed. It established commercial relations with Japan, occupied the island of Java, and the new capital, Batavia, became the centre of a very extensive commerce. The company successively established itself at Negapatnam, at Calicut, in Cochin China, the island of Ceylon, at Malacca, &c. The possession of the Cape of Good Hope (1653) guaranteed the navigation of the company, and the navy of the confederation, so great in the wars with England, under such

admirals as Tromp and Ruyter, became the most formidable in Europe.

But that extensive domination was not to be of a long duration. John de Witt, led to complicated negotiations with the neighbouring states, had neglected the army. The Dutch had only faith in the sea. Louis XIV. attacked the united provinces with 180,000 men; Holland could only oppose to him about 25,000 bad soldiers. A moment of despair assailed the republic. That amphibious state thought of flying to Batavia with her treasures, but the French conquest subsiding, the people determined to resist; they vented their wrath in a furious insurrection; they fell on De Witt and his brother, whom they tore to pieces, and the forces of the republic were entrusted to the young William of Orange, afterwards William III. of England, chief of the European opposition against France. William was proclaimed stadtholder. In order to save Holland from the French invasion, he laid the country under water; all the canals were opened, and then he succeeded in arming a part of Europe against the arrogant power of France. Although often vanquished by such men as Condé, yet his heroic resistance and admirable retreats were equal to the most brilliant victories. When he became king of England, his policy continued to direct the united provinces; a collateral branch of his family, also devoted to England, was aspiring at the dignity of stadtholder. The dissensions between the party of civil patriotism and the Orangists continued. The latter triumphed in 1747, when the hereditary stadtholderate was restored in favour of William IV. But under the son of the latter the struggle re-commenced; the civil-patriotic party remained for some years master of the government, and formed an alliance with France; then the Prussian army interfered; William IV. recovered the supreme authority, and preserved it until the French Revolution exploded, and again deprived him of it. Already Holland had lost her former commercial and maritime splendour; her star waned and vanished under that of England; her colonies and navy and commerce were a mere shadow

of former greatness during the latter part of the eighteenth century.

Germany became subject to a final partition by the peace of Westphalia. The diet that was held annually had lost all interest, and every one of the immediate princes were sovereigns in their states. Those who were the most powerful endeavoured to augment their power by external alliances, and under Louis XIV. several of them associated themselves with the policy of France. All real unity had vanished, and from the year of the peace of Westphalia (1648) to the present time, the history of Germany is nothing more than the history of Austria and Prussia. The various states of Germany are making great efforts to attain that unity that will enable them to resist effectually the pretensions of the colossal autocrat of the North, and a Germanic parliament, despite the obstacles and opposition, will ultimately consolidate the unity of Germany. The thirty years' war undoubtedly made Austria and Spain descend from their pre-eminent position. France became the predominating power, Austria remaining nothing more than a rival, yet a very formidable one, owing to the sympathies and support of England, equally alarmed at the unbounded pretensions of the French monarch. The princes of the house of Hapsburg, like the other kings of Europe, were absolute since the provincial states had been successively annulled, and they, also, did not take advantage of their unlimited authority in order to ameliorate the condition of their subjects. Two interests especially occupied them after 1648 until 1748, the year of the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, which closed the war of the succession of Austria, viz., the pretensions and encroachments of France; and the defence of the empire against the Turks, one of the conditions of which was the consolidation of the Austrian authority in Hungary and Transylvania.

The Emperor Ferdinand III., who was presiding over the destinies of Germany since 1637, after the peace of Westphalia, passed the remainder of his reign in tranquillity. He died in 1657, and the interregnum that followed showed the

alarming preponderance of France. Her recent victories encouraged her ministers to demand the imperial crown for the youthful Louis XIV. Four of the electors had been gained by that monarch's gold. Fortunately for Germany and for Europe, the other electors, animated by true patriotism, determined to elect a native prince by their own authority, and Leopold I., son of the late emperor, was raised to the vacant dignity. His reign was one of great humiliation to his house and to the empire. Feeble, bigoted, pusillanimous, he was little qualified to augment the glory of his country, although its prosperity was the great object which he endeavoured to promote, however ineffectually. Louis became a terrific scourge to Germany. The regions bordering on the Rhine were often transformed into a perfect desert. Europe united to arrest the torrent of French conquest, and oppose the common enemy. The campaigns of the French generals, Condé, Turenne, Luxembourg, and Catinat, will ever remain memorable. Finally, a congress assembled at Nimeguen, where, after long negotiations, peace was concluded (1678-9). But other foes assailed the Austrian empire. Transylvania was forming an almost independent state, the possession of which was a source of jealousy and dispute between Austria and Turkey. In 1661, the election of a Waiwode gave rise to a war. The Austrian armies, commanded by Montecuculli, were victorious; a truce of twenty years was concluded in 1664, but broken before the expiration of the term. The struggle re-commenced in 1682, and the vizir, Kara Mustapha, made Austria tremble. Vienna was besieged, but saved by the arrival of the Poles under the immortal Sobieski. During the memorable campaign of 1683, the Polish hero, in conjunction with the imperial generals, forced the vizir to raise the siege of Vienna, and made the invading tide roll back to the frontiers of the Ottoman empire. Afterwards, an alliance with Venice, and the skilful command of Prince Eugene, restored the Austrian affairs. By the treaty of Carlovitz (1699), Austria kept possession of Transylvania, and Venice kept Morea. In the meantime, the insurrectionary

movements of Hungary were appeased; the Magyars had long resisted the despotic encroachments of Austria, and had taken advantage of the Turkish war to take arms under Tekhely: they were vanquished after a memorable defence. The Hungarian crown became hereditary in the Austrian family, but the nobility retained very extensive privileges. Gradually the animosity between the two races disappeared, and Hungary soon found an opportunity of evincing a lofty devotedness for the Austrian monarchs. The Magyars were, until very recently, the aristocracy of Hungary, the owners of the land, the proud conquerors and merciless masters of the people, Slavonians and slaves.

In 1686, the league of Augsburg was formed against France. Europe was again uniting against Louis XIV. He was said to have excited the Hungarians to rebellion, and to have invited the Turks to the invasion of Austria. A rancorous feeling dwelt in the hearts of all. Soon after, William III., the mortal foe of Louis and of France, became king of England. The war became general. During several years it was carried on with varied success on land and sea; but finally the ravages of the French corsairs, and the victories of Luxembourg and Catinat, rendered the allies disposed to peace. The French navy, however, had been annihilated at the battle of the Hogue (1692). That victory forms the era of the English domination over the seas; the defection of Savoy decided the allies to renew negotiations. A congress met at Ryswick, and a peace was signed in that city in 1698. But this peace was only a truce granted to the sufferings of the people. The courts of Europe were occupied with a new impending cause of ambition and warfare—the Spanish succession, which led to a fearful sanguinary struggle of many years (1700-1712), of which we have already spoken.

The Emperor Leopold I., although possessing no talent for war, and never present at a battle, was victorious in many of the wars of his reign. Probably his mediocrity served his cause better than the greatest talents could have done, since it diminished the dread which Europe had long

entertained of his aspiring family, and which was now transferred to his ambitious rival, the king of France. Joseph I., son of Leopold, succeeded to the imperial crown in 1705. His reign was short, but fruitful in great events. By the victories of his general, Eugene, and of the greater Marlborough, France was brought to a state of prostration she had scarcely ever experienced before. Internally, the reign of this emperor is remarkable for the suppression of the Bavarian electorate, in punishment of the tenacity with which the late elector had clung to the alliance of France; and for the transferment of the dignity to the court palatine. His happiness was embittered by a rebellion in Hungary, an event of frequent recurrence; but here, also, he triumphed. Joseph I. died of the small-pox in Spain (1711), having had the satisfaction to learn that Philip was expelled from the capital, and his brother acknowledged by nearly all the great cities of the kingdom; he was learned, honourable, charitable, humane, patriotic, and neither a bigot or persecutor, but extremely tolerant. By his death, his brother, the Archduke Charles, who was striving for the Spanish crown, as the last male heir of the house of Hapsburg, was the only candidate for the imperial throne. Charles forsook the scenes of his battles, and hastened from Spain to seize the more brilliant prize offered him by his brother's decease, without abandoning his claims to Spain and the Indies; but the public mind of Europe was now changed. The dread of seeing the crowns of Spain and France on the same brow was not even so strong as the objections against the union of the Spanish and imperial crowns. The fall of the Whigs in England weakened the confederacy. Negotiations were opened; and Philip V., the Bourbon reigning monarch of Spain, renouncing the throne of France, peace was concluded at Utrecht (1713). Among its conditions may be named the following:—The Rhine was fixed as the boundary of the French and German possessions; Milan and Naples ceded to the house of Austria; the Spanish Netherlands were declared subject to the same family; the elector of Brandenburg was recognised by all Europe as king of

Prussia ; a new line of frontier from Luxembourg to Mons was determined between France and the Low Countries ; Anne was acknowledged as queen of England, and the succession to rest in the house of Hanover. The duke of Savoy obtained also the title of king, with an augmentation of territory (Sicily). The emperor had resolved to continue the war notwithstanding the peace of Utrecht, but feeling that he was unequal to it, he concluded peace with France, in the following year, at Baden. At the demand of Louis, the elector of Bavaria was restored to all his honours and possessions.*

The treaties of Utrecht and Rastadt brought a change on the face of Europe. The Spanish monarchy was dismembered, and although France retained something of her former importance, yet her influence was considerably diminished ; but England was the power that derived the greatest advantage from them ; she was the supreme maritime power in Europe, and was anxious, along with Austria and France, to maintain the strict observance of the treaty of Utrecht. But the ambitious Elizabeth of Parma, second wife to Philip V. of Spain, anxious to find some regal situation for her two younger sons, soon disturbed the tranquillity of Europe. She had raised to the rank of prime minister a man talented, bold, and enterprising—Alberoni. Spanish troops suddenly invaded Sardinia and Sicily (1717). But England, France, Austria, and the Netherlands, formed a quadruple alliance, and commenced the war. Elizabeth abandoned her minister, and obtained peace, and with it, Tuscany, Parma, and Piacenza, for her son, Don Carlos. Austria exchanged Sardinia for Sicily. But throughout Europe there was continual distrust, the natural result of faithless dealings. The position of the parties continually varied, and the whole policy of Europe was directed by the meanest considerations. Sometimes negotiations were abandoned for open hostilities. Fleury and Robert Walpole had made every sacrifice to preserve peace ; a new congress assembled at Soissons (1728), and peace seemed

* See Appendix, No. IX. (b.)

firmly established, when the election of Frederick Augustus of Saxony to the throne of Poland became a new source of discord. France, Spain and Sardinia supported the king previously elected, Stanislas Leczinski ; Russia and Austria gave their aid to the elector of Saxony. A war ensued. However, in 1783, France consented that Stanislas should renounce the Polish crown, in return for the duchy of Lorraine, on his death to be incorporated with the French monarchy. But there was already a duke of Lorraine, who two years before had married the eldest daughter of the Emperor Charles. He received, by way of compensation, the grand duchy of Tuscany. Hence, again, it was necessary to satisfy Don Carlos ; he had, with the aid of Spain, just conquered both Naples and Sicily, and by the present treaty of Vienna he was acknowledged king of the Two Sicilies. During the two following years, the last of the emperor's reign, he enjoyed peace with all Europe, excepting Turkey. Early in his reign, in order to guard against a contested succession, Charles had published the famous Pragmatic Sanction, by which he vested the succession, first in his male children, and secondly, in their default, in his female children, in the order of primogeniture. He had procured the guarantee of this celebrated Sanction both from the diet of the empire, and from the chief powers of Europe.

Charles VI., the last male heir of the house of Hapsburg-Austria, died in 1740, and Maria-Theresa was, in accordance both with the rights of blood and the faith of treaties, the lawful sovereign of all her father's dominions. But she soon experienced the faithlessness of princes ; all those who had guaranteed her succession took arms against her ; they revived antiquated, imaginary titles. The elector of Bavaria claimed no less than the imperial dignity, and in this he was supported by France. Then, those chivalrous Christian princes of Christian Europe beheld a glorious prospect of dismembering the states of a young helpless female. One of her most formidable competitors and dangerous foes was Frederick II., king of Prussia.

Towards the close of the fifteenth century, the margraves of Brandenburg had acquired a certain importance in Germany. One member of their family, Albert of Brandenburg, had secularised (1525) to his own advantage the duchy of Prussia, and, by the extinction of this collateral branch, this duchy had aggrandised the possessions of the direct line. During the first wars of Louis XIV. the Brandenburgs participated successfully in the European struggles, and, in 1701, Frederick, devoured by the ambition of possessing the regal title, obtained this satisfaction from the Emperor Leopold. The young Prussian kingdom, thus formed, became the object of the scornful sarcasms of the ancient European courts. This state, nevertheless, grew up in the midst of sterile plains, without any natural barriers—deprived of canals and mountains; it became a formidable political creation, a pure result of warfare and struggles, and of an indomitable will—of human liberty triumphing over nature. Frederick William, successor to the first Frederick, is celebrated for his coarseness and brutality. His ambition consisted in heaping up treasures, and forming a superior military force. He hated his son, who was a poet, philosopher, and musician—and this son, Frederick II., the Great, once king, made all the treasures and regiments of his father the instruments of his vast designs. Frederick the Second's characteristic was an invincible volition. His *will* was to be brave—to render Prussia one of the first states in Europe—to become a legislator and administrator—and to make his deserted country the fatherland of a large and happy population. He succeeded in all. No commander ever possessed in a higher degree the genius of warfare; he holds an immortal place in the art of war, and belongs to that series of great modern innovators and tacticians, commencing with Gustavus Adolphus, continued by Turenne, Marlborough, and closing with Napoleon. Frederick II. was deeply versed in the administration and protection of material interest; but he was void of all moral feeling. A disciple of the philosophy of the eighteenth century, he was, therefore, incredulous and egotistical; he did nothing for the

liberty of his subjects; on the contrary, the royal authority became more absolute, and serfdom remained the lot of the peasants. He was the founder of that odious and iniquitous polity of Prussia—viz., self-aggrandisement at the expense of the neighbours, contrary to every right and justice. The conquest of Silesia, and the first partition of Poland, were the fruits of this political system. During the whole of his lifetime, he remained the arbiter of Europe. His successor, Frederick-William II. (1786), although not gifted with any superior faculties, owed to circumstances the acquisition of another portion of Poland, and the French Revolution found him foremost to oppose that great movement which threatened all the crowns of Europe.

Maria-Theresa, thus assailed by Europe, resisted with surpassing energy. The king of Prussia conquered the greater part of Silesia, having defeated the Austrians at Molwitz (1741). She stood alone—her cause seemed ruined; she was then pregnant, and was heard to exclaim, that she would not have a city left where to give birth to her child. In 1742, the elector of Bavaria was proclaimed emperor, and took the name of Charles VII. But England and Holland could not behold with indifference the triumph of France; they prepared to aid her effectually. In the meantime, Frederick, satisfied with Silesia, made overtures of peace, to which Maria-Theresa was compelled to accede. The French were defeated in Bohemia, and retreated across the snows; subsequently, the English defeated the French. The empress, moreover, was supported by Hungary, which exhibited the most chivalrous devotion to her cause: but Maria-Theresa was naturally arrogant,—she did not evince any moderation in success; she showed, on the contrary, symptoms of a vindictive nature, and insisted on the total ruin of her enemies. The crafty king of Prussia dreaded the ascendancy of Maria-Theresa, and he renewed the hostilities, joining France and Bavaria. The war was carried on in Italy, Germany, and at sea, with varied success. If an army was expelled in one campaign from the empire, it re-appeared the next spring. If Frederick was

humbled in one battle, he was victorious in the next. In 1745, at the death of the Emperor Charles VII., his son, in accordance with his father's last instructions, made peace with Austria, approved the Pragmatic Sanction, and Maria-Theresa had her husband, the grand duke of Tuscany, duly elected to the imperial dignity. The war was, nevertheless, continued. The reign of Francis I. was one of troubles; if victorious one day, he was humbled the next. Finally, a congress assembled at Aix-la-Chapelle, and the peace concluded without any very important results for either party (1748).*

Prussia had acquired by this war a very brilliant position, and the force and ambition of England were considerably augmented. Negotiations were carried on, but along with them endless intrigues. All parties were secretly preparing for war, and the vindictive disposition of Maria-Theresa induced her to direct her undivided efforts against Frederick II. In order to secure the assistance of France, she stooped to solicit the intervention of one of the omnipotent prostitutes of Louis XV.; she sullied her majesty by addressing an autograph and flattering epistle to Madame de Pompadour; and the great powers of Europe leagued themselves to crush Prussia. The pretence for the commencement of hostilities was the interpretation of one of the articles of the treaty of Utrecht—the reciprocal limits of the English and French colonies, especially those of Nova Scotia. Thus the seven years' war broke out (1756-1763), the only ally of Prussia being England, whose insular situation and commercial habits rendered her unable to cope with the great powers of the continent; but she was governed by Lord Chatham, and no efforts were spared.

The seven years' war is eternally memorable, owing to the campaigns of Frederick. It was a marvellous thing to behold the almost imperceptible kingdom of Prussia—surrounded by the masses from Austria, Russia, France, and Saxony—and its king, fly from one to the other, and face them all. He inflicted

* See Appendix, No. IX. (c.)

deadly defeats on all his enemies successively: yet, if often victorious, he was sometimes vanquished; and his very advantages were bought at such expense of blood and treasure that they were scarcely less hurtful than defeats. Happily, in 1762, on the accession of Peter III., czar of Russia, Frederick had one enemy less. The wonderful mental resources of the king of Prussia—the extraordinary measures by which he made Europe tremble, when his fate seemed sealed, called forth an unmingled admiration. Germany, moreover, was dreadfully wasted; a universal cry for peace was heard; conferences were opened at Hubertsburg, in Saxony, and the conditions of peace signed in February (1763).*

On the death of Francis I., in 1765, his son, Joseph II., became the acknowledged head of the empire. He had but little power, his mother, Maria-Theresa, holding the absolute sovereignty, which all his efforts could not wrest from her hands; he, therefore, rather acquiesced in, than effected, the infamous partition of Poland between his mother, the empress of Russia, and the Prussian monarch. Joseph II. was a philosopher, and was tormented by a hasty desire to introduce amelioration and innovations; he acted, therefore, without judgment, and failed in all his enterprises. Internally, he endeavoured to abolish privileges, and to free the serfs, but insurrections forced him to yield; externally, his ambition knew of no moral boundary. At the death of the elector of Bavaria, without male issue (1777), he claimed the Bavarian succession, and ordered possession to be taken of the country; but Frederick of Prussia, after vain attempts at negotiation, poured an overwhelming army against the imperial pretensions; Maria-Theresa, dreading the consequences of a war with such a man as the Prussian king, opened secret negotiations, despite the opposition of her son, and peace was restored at Teschen (1779). On the decease of his mother (1780), Joseph II. gave vent to his ambition and to his inconsiderate and hasty desire of being a great reformer. With the best intentions,

* See Appendix, No. IX. (d.)

and in order to give a salutary unity to the administration of the empire, he outraged the prejudices and interests of his subjects, and became, especially in the Netherlands, an object of execration; he certainly was one of the causes which led to their separation from the Austrian monarchy, when the French republicans emboldened them to obtain their independence. In his wild ambition, he turned his eyes towards Turkey, and, by forming an alliance with Russia, he appeared as principal in the war with the Porte, hoping to extend the boundaries of his empire; but, although at the head of a great army, his own operations covered him with disgrace, and this probably shortened the days of the rash and misguided emperor. As Joseph left no issue, his brother Leopold II. succeeded to the hereditary dominions of the house of Austria (1790). He had acquired a well-deserved popularity as grand duke of Tuscany, and possessed qualities which were sure to win the hearts of his own subjects; he abolished the more odious innovations of his brother, and had no difficulty in procuring the imperial crown. He established his empire over the proud magnates of Hungary by restoring such of their ancient privileges as had been disregarded. He joined Prussia for the purpose of arresting the new republican principles of France, and with the French revolution commences a new era in the history of Germany and of Europe.

Spain, Italy, and Portugal, nations that had so recently convulsed Europe, and exhibited to the world a surpassing activity and energy, had now become a lifeless and enervated mass. It was the result of an egotistical and senseless despotism. The means of popular activity were decayed, and those who exercised the supreme authority were incapable of bringing to any useful end the forces and vitality yet remaining. In Spain, the *cortes* had insensibly vanished under Philip II. The nobles were consuming, in a dormant sensuality, their immense wealth. Industry, commerce and agriculture were in a state of torpor, and the nation, satisfied with having preserved her municipal liberties, slumbered in a disgraceful repose. The governments of the successors of

Philip II. are characterised by an absolute nullity of administration, and a general disorder; they were mostly implicitly ruled by a favourite minister. Philip III. (1598) gave all his confidence to the duke of Lerma, who reigned in his place; a despicable policy made him expel from the kingdom all the Moors, who were the most industrious of its inhabitants (1610). The national weakness, and its disorders, increased under Philip IV. (1621), who, equally spiritless as his father, was governed by his minister Olivarez. His reign was one continued series of miscarriages and defeats. The Dutch seized Brazil, the French invaded Artois, Catalonia revolted to France, and Portugal shook off its yoke and became an independent kingdom. The regent, Anne of Austria, during the minority of Charles II. (1665), was ruled by her confessor, Nithard, then Don John of Austria, and Charles II. himself by Oropeza. On Charles II. dying childless (1700), commenced the European war for the succession of Spain. Philip V. of Anjou, of the house of Bourbon, was finally acknowledged king of Spain; but that kingdom lost all its Italian possessions. The ambition of Elizabeth of Parma, second wife to Philip V., and the activity of her minister Alberoni, raised, for a time, the Spanish influence, but it soon after returned to its former nullity. During the reigns of Ferdinand VI. (1746), and of Charles III. (1759), Spain was engaged in the continental wars. By the treaty called the *family compact*, signed in 1761, she became the close ally of France. The accession of Charles IV. (1788) is cotemporaneous with the commencement of the French Revolution, and Spain was involved in the disturbances of that great epoch.

The Inquisition had been in Spain one of the most potent instruments that contributed to the establishment of an absolute monarchy. Created by Ferdinand in 1484, that tribunal was, above all, a political institution. The vast number of Mohammedans and Jews in the Spanish realm, the influence they seemed to exercise by their creeds and manners over a facile and sensual Catholicism, had convinced the heartless Ferdinand that, for the preservation of the nationality, a terrible instru-

ment of repression was necessary. That institution assumed, therefore, a moral character ; it covered its political vengeance and dastard obedience to royalty with a religious surface, and carried on, in the name of Jesus Christ, a system of bloody persecution—of iniquitous trials—and every refinement of torture and rack in its dark dungeons. Nevertheless, the influence of the Arabs has left various elements in the manners and feelings of the Spaniards. On the other hand, that inertness natural to the Spanish character evinced itself in their religion, and hence that multiplicity of convents. Spain adopted a narrow, false, mutilated devotion, instead of the progressive spirit of Christianity.

Italy was still more dead to political life than Spain. Liberty had perished in that fair peninsula, and no hope of its return seemed perceptible. The lands and people of Italy were mere tools for the kings of Europe in all their treaties and territorial changes. They were the victims of the vilest violation of the right of nations established as a political right. The history of the independent states of Italy is void of interest during this period. Venice, Genoa and the Pontifical State, were happy in being allowed to exist, and were but very indirectly mixed in the European affairs. The duchy of Savoy took, under Victor-Amedeus II., an active and successful part in the wars against Louis XIV., and thus gained Sicily, exchanged soon after for Sardinia. The reigning houses of Parma, Tuscany, and Placenza, became extinct. Tuscany was assigned to the duke of Lorraine, and Parma and Placenza to a Bourbon of Spain. Austria had the possession of the Milanese, of Sardinia and the kingdom of Naples, guaranteed by the peace of Utrecht. Naples, with the exception of the romantic popular revolt of the fisherman Massaniello, in 1648, long suffered with patience the foreign yoke. Together with Sicily, it formed, in 1759, a sovereignty for Ferdinand IV., third son of Philip V., of Spain ; and his posterity is one of the remains of the decayed race of the Bourbons. During the French Revolution, Italy became again the frequent theatre of the war and of remarkable events : in 1815, it returned to oppression,

and was bowed down, yet palpitating for liberty, despite the groans of the victim—but now finally the knell of despotism is tolling from the foot of the Alps to the shores of the Thyr-rhenean Sea—and the words, Liberty, Unity, and Nationality, are bursting from every Italian heart. They may be smothered for awhile, but will prove indestructible.

We have spoken of the conquest of Portugal by Philip II. The foreign domination was disastrous for the vanquished nation. Portugal suffered mostly from the war of Spain with the Netherlands; the Dutch fell with furious obstinacy on her colonies, and, when that nation recovered her liberty, all her Indian possessions were lost. All that remained of the former colonial splendour of the Portuguese consisted now in a few settlements on the African coasts, Madeira, and the Brazils. Towards the end of the seventeenth century only, gold and diamond mines were discovered in Brazil; this colony was more successfully developed, but Portugal has never even approached the distinguished rank it held among nations during the sixteenth century. The government of the house of Braganza does not offer anything very remarkable. The war with Spain was terminated in 1668. Seven years before, a peace had been concluded with Holland. In 1667, a revolution in the palace overthrew the imbecile Alphonso VI. from the throne, and installed in his place his brother Peter II. Once more Portugal was raised from its mediocrity, owing to the administration of the marquis of Pombal. King Joseph I. (1750) entrusted him with the direction of affairs, and Pombal displayed very superior talent. His admirers have compared him to Richelieu. He certainly had no superior in the internal and economical administration of the kingdom—in discernment, activity, and legislative abilities, he may be said to have regenerated Portugal; he favoured manufactures and agriculture, encouraged science and literature, introduced into the Brazils the cultivation of coffee, sugar, cotton, rice, indigo, and cocoa; he created commercial companies, and established a most admirable police in the kingdom; like all superior men, Pombal had many enemies; he baffled their hostilities,

but, on the death of Joseph I. (1777), he was obliged to retire, leaving Portugal in a state of prosperity that vanished with him. A proud, ignorant, corrupt nobility recovered the former ascendancy, and Portugal was re-plunged in a state of lifeless abasement, which is still the character of that nation.

Our task is nearly terminated ; we have yet to cast a glance on the nations of the North, and then abandon the numerous revolutions of governments, in order to examine the symptoms of progress in the social organisation and the developments of the human mind and reason under the auspices of Christianity.

CHAPTER XII.

Fourth Period continued.—Scandinavia.—Succession of Christian II. in Denmark.—Peace of Stettin (1570).—State and Decline of Denmark.—Sweden.—Successors of Gustavus Wasa.—Gustavus Adolphus (1611).—Charles XII. (1697).—Wars and Decline of Sweden.—Constitutions of Sweden and Norway.—Poland.—Succession of the Jagellons.—Wars.—Internal Dissensions.—Influence of Russia.—First Partition of Poland (1772); the Second (1793).—Poland extinct (1795).—Russia.—Accession of the House of Romanow (1613).—State of Russia.—Peter the Great.—Catharine II.—Russian Policy.—Sketches of the Intellectual, Moral, and Social History of Europe since the Sixteenth Century.—Intellectual Developments.—Lord Bacon.—Descartes.—Newton.—Leibnitz.—Pascal.—Natural Philosophy.—Chemistry.—Natural History.—Botany.—Medicine.—Architecture.—Painting.—Music.—Literature.—Formation of the Modern Languages and Literatures.—Literature of England.—Of France.—Of Germany and Spain.—Decline of the Political Influence of the Church of Rome.—Character of the Religious Assemblies and Institutions.—Surpassing Activity of the Church of Rome.—Dissensions.—The Jansenists.—Triumph and Decline of the Jesuits.—Present State of the Church of Rome and of Protestantism.—Progress of the Material Interests and of Commerce.—Characters of France, England, and Russia.—Germany.—Spain.—Italy.—Switzerland.—Holland.—Material State of the Nations of Europe.—Discoveries.—Innovations.—General Progress.—The Fourth Period in the History of European Civilization, concluded.—Fifth Period, commencing with the French Revolution of 1789.—Its Character and Consequences.—Napoleon.—Present State of Europe.—Prospects of Christian Civilisation.—Nature of Man.—Final Reign of Truth and of Christian Justice.

THE principles of the treaty of Westphalia re-acted, although indirectly, on the nations of the North. Few among them had taken an active and material part in the European dis-

cords, and even there their sphere of action was confined to a narrow circle. Their policy only became merged in that of the rest of Europe, after the immeasurable augmentation of Russian power, and during the convulsions occasioned by the French Revolution. But, previous to our commencing a brief delineation of the special character of the international relations between the Northern States and Central Europe, we must devote a little attention to each of those nations whose history we have sketched down to the sixteenth century only.

Scandinavia had lost that unity which had been the result, not of harmony and sympathy, but of the force of arms. We have seen Christian II. and his Danes expelled from Sweden by Gustavus Wasa. The Danish king provoked also the hostility of the aristocracies in Denmark and in Norway, which, nevertheless, remained united to the Danish crown until a late period, and both shook off their allegiance to the tyrant. Under his successor, Frederick I. (1523), and Christian III. (1534), Protestantism was introduced in those countries by the nobility, and this body, by frequent capitulations and treaties with the kings, added considerably to its own privileges, almost annulled the royal authority, and oppressed more than ever the citizens and the peasants. To Christian III. succeeded Frederick II. (1559), under whom terminated the long quarrel that distracted Scandinavia since the rupture of the union of Calmar. The peace of Stettin (1570) regulated the international relations between Sweden and Denmark; and the latter kingdom remained in peace and tranquillity during the long reign of Frederick II. His successor, Christian IV. (1588), a good administrator, governed skilfully, but unfortunately he was no general, and he compromised the prosperity and happiness of Denmark by attacking Gustavus Adolphus (1611-13), and by taking a part in the thirty years' war. His son, Frederick III. (1648), succeeded in consolidating the power of the crown. At the diet of 1661, the clergy and citizens assembled, and, by a solemn law, the crown was declared hereditary, and invested with an absolute authority. From that time, Denmark, although implicated sometimes in

some of the European wars, but engaged in a perpetual struggle with the house of Holstein-Gottorp, one of the branches of the reigning family, never resumed its former preponderance in Scandinavia. Denmark no longer acted an important part in history; and none of the sovereigns that occupied the Danish throne since, have succeeded in restoring to it any of that *éclat* which had formerly shone with so much lustre. Denmark, therefore, is an absolute and hereditary monarchy, founded on three fundamental laws—the act of sovereignty of 1661, the king's law (*Konge Lowen*) of 1665, solemnly ratified by the whole nation, and the native subjects' law (*Indfottts retten*) of 1776. After the close of a war with Sweden, in 1720, Denmark enjoyed nearly a hundred years of continued tranquillity, during which the kingdom attained great prosperity: the happiest fruits of this peace were the abolition of serfdom among the peasantry, begun by Christian VII., in 1767, the extinction of the negro slave-trade, and the establishment of a greater liberty of the press.

Sweden had been governed with great vigour by Gustavus Wasa. The aristocracy had seen its privileges decline,—many of them annihilated; the throne had become hereditary. But, at his death (1560), his unworthy and cruel son Eric succeeded him; and, besieged by his brothers, was obliged to give up the crown to one of them, John III. (1568). John was inclined to Roman Catholicism, but the opposition of the States prevented him from offering the spectacle of an open conversion. His son Sigismund, however, became a Roman Catholic, and received, by election, the crown of Poland. On his father's death (1592), he found himself in a difficult position. Sweden was Protestant; Poland, Roman Catholic: both claimed Livonia. Sigismund's uncle, Charles IX., chief of the Lutheran party in Sweden, prevailed over his nephew by his policy (1595), and by his arms (1598). Sigismund had been crowned in 1594, and was solemnly deposed at the States held at Nicoping (1604). Hence a long war between the two nations, only interrupted when they made Russia their field of battle,—renewed afterwards by the great Gustavus, suspended by

a long truce, and terminated long after, when Poland yielded to the ascendancy of Sweden.

To Charles IX. succeeded Gustavus Adolphus (1611). After terminating advantageously his war with Denmark, Russia, and Poland, he carried his arms to a vaster field of glory, and made Sweden the first nation in Europe. We have seen his death on the celebrated field of Lutzen ; but his policy survived him. His chancellor-minister-general, Oxenstiern, accomplished his master's great views, and consolidated the aggrandisement of Sweden. Christina, daughter of the hero, had succeeded her father (1632), at the age of six years, under the guardianship of Oxenstiern, who governed the kingdom with consummate ability. Christina, a female pedant, devoted to abstruse literature, insensible to the great mission that Providence seemed to have assigned to her, abdicated the crown (1654) in favour of her cousin, and retired to Rome, having embraced the Roman Catholic faith. The new king, Charles Gustavus X., followed the glorious steps of the great Gustavus ; he renewed the war with Poland, menaced Copenhagen, because Denmark had espoused the Polish cause, and compelled the cession of several Danish provinces beyond the Sound. A fresh attempt to subdue Denmark was frustrated by the succour of the Prussians and Dutch ; the disappointed ambition of the king is said to have hastened his death (1660). During the minority of his son, Charles XI., the long contest with Poland was concluded by the peace of Oliva. With the insignificant reign of Charles XI, Sweden declined from her supremacy in the North, the continuation of which was beyond her real strength. Several changes of policy were produced at court by the rise of the French and anti-French parties. The former at length predominated, and gave rise to a war between Prussia and Denmark, in which the Swedes generally were worsted, but regained all that they had lost at the peace of Fontainebleau (1679). This reign beheld also the first struggle between the crown, supported by the burghers and peasants, and the power of the senate and nobles : the resumption of the crown lands (1680), and the liquidation of the public debt

by raising the value of the currency (1686), were the preliminary measures; and, in 1693, the king was formally declared absolute by an act of the diet. He died in 1697, leaving his dominions to his son, the famous Charles XII., then only fifteen. His inexperience tempted the attacks of his neighbours, and a coalition was formed against him by Poland, Denmark, and Russia. Charles assumed the offensive—defeated the Danes, routed the czar before Narva, invaded Poland, gained several victories, took Warsaw, and dictated the election of Stanislas Leczinski to the Polish throne (1704). Europe viewed his exploits with amazement; but his invasion of Russia (1708-9) was fatal to his schemes of ambition. He was overthrown at Pultowa, and took refuge for five years in Turkey, while all his conquests were lost as rapidly as they had been gained. In 1715 he returned to Sweden, and while he was endeavouring to re-establish his power, both by arms and the subtle diplomacy of his minister Görtz, he fell at the siege of Fredericshall, in Norway (1718), leaving his kingdom on the verge of ruin. All the fruits of past victories were lost. Charles had endeavoured to humble and annul the aristocracy; but when his sister Ulrica-Eleonora was proclaimed by the senate as elected queen, she was compelled to renounce all hereditary right, and restore the constitution as before 1693. In 1720, after concluding the peace of Stockholm, she resigned the crown in favour of her husband, Frederick, of Hesse-Cassel, whose authority was still further limited by the Act of Royal Assurance, exacted from him by the States. The treaty of Nystad with Russia (1721), at length gave peace to the exhausted kingdom; but Ingria, Livonia, Esthonia, Carelia, &c., were ceded to the czar, and Sweden sunk thenceforth into a second-rate power, under the all-absorbing influence of Russia.

For the next twenty years the court of Stockholm was a scene of foreign intrigue and corruption, in which the *Hats*, or French party, and the *Caps*, or Russian faction, alternately predominated, the royal prerogative being almost annihilated by the power of the aristocracy. Agriculture and commerce

were, nevertheless, flourishing, and legislation was improved by the publication of a new code (1734). The ascendancy of the *Hats* led to a war with Russia (1741), but the Swedes, being everywhere defeated, gladly obtained the peace of Abo (1743), and the recognition of Adolphus Frederick, of Holstein-Gottorp, as heir to the throne, the king being childless. Adolphus Frederick became, therefore, king of Sweden, in 1751, and his reign was peaceful in its foreign relations, with the exception of the share taken against Prussia in the seven years' war; but the struggles of parties at home kept the nation in a constant ferment, and the thralldom of the king by the nobles was carried to such an extent as to produce a threat of abdication. The counter-revolution, however, did not take place till the accession of his son, Gustavus III. (1771), who, supported by the arms and the body of the people, forcibly repealed the constitution of 1720, re-establishing the relative powers of the various branches of government nearly as before 1680; while the party names of *Hats* and *Caps* were for ever prohibited, the use of torture abolished, and the press declared free. No rupture followed, although these changes were odious to Russia. But an alliance with the Porte (1787) led to a war with Russia and Denmark; the Swedish officers refusing to march without orders from the States, produced the Act of Safety (1789), which was forced on the nobles by the other orders of the diet, and which gave the king absolute power of war and peace, at the same time abolishing the senate, the last stronghold of aristocratic power. A maritime warfare was then carried on with Russia, with equal advantages; and, after a decisive victory of the Swedes, peace was concluded, on the basis of mutual restoration. At the outbreak of the French Revolution, Gustavus III. had joined a coalition for the invasion of France, but was assassinated at a masked ball, and thus fell a victim to the vengeance of the nobles (1792). His brother, who became regent for his nephew, not only withdrew from the coalition, but recognised the French Republic.

The Swedish constitution, despite its repeated fluctuations

between absolute monarchy and aristocratic predominance, may be considered as having been settled, since the last modifications in 1809, into a fair equilibrium. The crown is hereditary in the male line, and the king required to profess the Lutheran religion; he has a state council of nine members, who are his privileged advisers. The foreign relations, the administration of justice, and the command of the army and navy, are vested in the king, who has also a negative voice on the resolutions of the diet, and the right to introduce measures for their consideration; but he can neither control the freedom of their deliberations, nor impose new taxes, contract loans, or alienate any part of the territory. The diet, or parliament of the kingdom, in which resides the supreme legislative power, consists, as of old, of the four orders—of nobles, clergy, burghers, and peasants (landholders, who are not noble): the number of members varies considerably. The house of nobles is generally attended by a number varying from 400 to 500. The ecclesiastical order consists of twelve, and sixty deputies; the archbishop of Upsala being always their president. The presidents of the burgher and peasant houses are named by the king, and a small property qualification is required for a deputy: the proper number of burgher representatives is 97, and that of the peasant deputies 144. The expenses of the representatives of the three last classes are partly reimbursed by their constituents; the civil and military *employés* of government usually form a large majority of the whole number. The questions are carried or lost by a simple majority; but when they involve a change in the laws or constitution, they are discussed by a general congress of the four orders, and can only be passed by a unanimous vote. The diet meet at Stockholm every five years, and should close at the end of three months, unless prevented by a press of business.

Let us add that Norway, annexed to Sweden in 1815, has a separate legislative body, or *storting*, composed of the representatives of the people, who are elected by electors who are chosen by the citizens. When the *storting* has been

opened by the king or his lieutenant, it separates into two bodies, the *lagthing*, or legislative body, and the *odelsting*, or assembly of landed proprietors. The *storting* is empowered to abolish old and to enact new laws, to impose taxes or abolish or change them, to determine the civil list of the king, &c. Every bill must originate in the *odelsting*, and pass into the *lagthing*; when twice rejected by the latter, both bodies unite and decide the matter in question by a joint vote. The king's signature is afterwards required; if rejected by him, it must be discussed in a second and a third *storting*; but if the third *storting* passes a bill rejected twice by the crown, it becomes a law, whether the king signs it or not. The members are chosen for one *storting*, and the executive power is vested in the king. We have thus outstepped our limits, and admitted this digression on the constitutions of Sweden and Norway, because they are the beneficial results of long efforts—of ancient and deep-rooted principles, which we had been unable to analyse, and because they form a striking contrast with the surrounding absolutism.

In *Poland*, during the preceding period, the result of the inherent vices of the constitution was manifested by a growing spirit of anarchy, and hence a succession of wars, generally fatal, was preparing the country to fall a prey to unprincipled neighbours. It is a gloomy and harrowing history, the general phases of which claim our attention. We have spoken of the last of the great race of the Jagellons, Sigismund Augustus. The most remarkable events of his reign had been the acquisition of Livonia, which voluntarily submitted to Poland—the union between Poland and Lithuania—and the great influence acquired by the Reformation among the higher classes. It is very probable that, had this monarch lived, a reform of the national church would have taken place, as he bestowed his favours chiefly on the promoters of that measure. After the death of Sigismund Augustus (1572), the throne was sought by foreign princes, and the nobility found in the elections new means for advancing their own welfare, and for adding to their privileges. Henry

of Anjou (Henry III. of France) was elected, but soon after returned to France, on the death of the king, his brother. In 1575, the Polish throne was, consequently, declared vacant, and Stephen Bathory elected; a fortunate choice, as he had risen, by his great merit, from a simple Hungarian noble to the dignity of sovereign prince of Transylvania. He attacked and defeated the Muscovites, and was making great preparations for another campaign against them when he died (1586). The electors selected Sigismund, son of the king of Sweden, for his successor. The Swedish prince, however, met with a sanguinary opposition, and defeated the insurgents. Extremely bigoted in his attachment to the church of Rome, he took advantage of the dissensions that distracted Muscovy to declare war against that country; his general, after a victorious campaign, entered Moscow, and concluded a treaty, by which the eldest son of Sigismund III. was elected czar (1610). But, soon after, the dishonesty of the Polish monarch irritated the Muscovites, who rose in arms, and, in the bloody war which ensued, the Polish army being unpaid, as the diet had refused to grant the necessary supplies, the insubordination of the troops hastened the conclusion of peace. Sigismund III. had, moreover, a war to sustain against the Turks, and was threatened by a formidable force of Tartars. By his pretensions to the throne of Sweden, he plunged Poland into a long and unfortunate war, already spoken of, and which continued under his sons Wladislas IV. and John Casimir, being concluded during the latter's reign, by the treaty of Oliva.

Sigismund III. had effected the entire destruction of Protestantism in Poland, when he died (1632). Under his enlightened son Wladislas, the country enjoyed a long peace; but, in the last moments of his life and reign (1648), a fierce rebellion broke out. A persecution of the followers of the Eastern church had been carried on through the influence of the Jesuits, whom Sigismund III. had firmly established in Poland. The Cossacks of the Ukraine flew to arms, and this rebellion raged for many years, under the brother and successor of Wladislas, John Casimir V. Charles Gustavus, of

Sweden, seized this opportunity for renewing hostilities, and he had made himself master of Poland, when the Muscovites came to the assistance of John Casimir, and restored him to his throne. But the aggressions of Russia soon involved Poland in a protracted war, which was again concluded by a peace in 1667; and John Casimir abdicated the throne, in 1668, to retire to Paris, where he died as abbé. His reign was one of the most unfortunate periods of Polish history, and the consequences were equally deplorable. Poland lost Ukraine, Smolensk, and many important districts; the country was depopulated by constant war and pestilence. In the meantime, the nobility continued to make new additions to their already extensive prerogatives. Under Sigismund, the *confederations* became a public right in Poland; that name was given to armed associations, formed by the nobility, when that body thought itself exposed to royal encroachments; those associations had legal power since the law of 1609, and thus insurrection and anarchy became organised. Under John Casimir, in 1652, the first example of *liberum veto* was seen, viz., the right assumed by every member to put a stop to all the deliberations of the diet, by withdrawing; this example became a law, and no diet afterwards assembled without some sanguinary disorders. Before this, the unanimity required in all decisions had filled with dissensions and tumultuous scenes all the assemblies, or *small diets*, preparatory to the great diet; frequently the sabre decided the question instead of argumentative reason. All those symptoms and elements of destruction were crowned by the *liberum veto*. The law was braved with impunity by many powerful nobles, and a preposterous system of education, which was entirely in the hands of the Jesuits, had completely benighted the nation. On the abdication of Casimir, the throne was given to a young man, Michael, who had no pretensions to this dignity; and when he died, in 1673, John Sobieski, who had just obtained a brilliant victory over the Turks, was elected. Sobieski's name is associated with his glorious victory over the Turks under the walls of Vienna; but he was only a hero—and Poland had

greater need of a legislator. In 1690, the duke of Saxony, Augustus II., was elected to succeed Sobieski. Poland was involved in the quarrels between Peter the Great and Charles XII. : Augustus lost the throne, and recovered it after disastrous wars. At his death, the election of his successor, Stanislas, gave rise to a new European war, already mentioned ; and, finally, the house of Saxony re-ascended the throne of Poland, in the person of Augustus III. (1733).

Under Augustus III. the nation remained in a state of exhaustion and torpor. The sovereign was entirely under the influence of the Russians, and the Russian court was very careful in not permitting any improvement of that constitution which kept the country in a state of perpetual disorganisation. The family of the Czartoryskis, who possessed immense wealth and great influence, undertook to establish a strong government as the only means of raising the country from its deplorable condition ; they displayed great abilities and activity for the attainment of their object. They endeavoured to gain the favour of the court of St. Petersburg, and their project might have been successful but for the accession of Catharine II., which entirely changed the state of affairs. At the death of Augustus, Stanislas Poniatowski, the lover of Catharine II., was elected, supported by a Russian force, and by his relations, the Czartoryskis (1764) ; the latter seized on this opportunity for bringing about the most salutary improvements and reforms. But Russia soon perceived how dangerous were those reforms which strengthened the government of that country, and it gave its support to a blind, ignorant and unprincipled opposition. The former abuses were restored, the government weakened, and Russia declared that state of things immutable. The Poles, anxious to save their country from foreign influence, organised a confederation at Bar, in Podolia ; and, although wretchedly supported, it struggled for several years against the forces of Russia, until it fell through exhaustion, and the first partition of Poland, planned by Frederick II. of Prussia, took place in 1772, by which it lost its best provinces, divided unequally between Russia,

Prussia, and Austria. The spoliating parties called a diet to sanction the iniquitous transaction, and deprived Poniatowski even of a shadow of authority. The nation, however, now strove to compensate its heavy loss by internal improvements. The public opinion became enlightened after a few years, and resulted in a general wish for a reform in the constitution of the country; the diet of 1788 proclaimed a new constitution and the necessity of further reforms; but the Poles had no national force capable of protecting their new constitution. Russia excited an hostile party, and formed a confederation to overthrow this new constitution, and Poniatowski betrayed the national cause; he became a party to the infamous Russian confederation, while Prussia, after having, by a vile treachery, encouraged the Polish patriots, now joined the Russians, and invaded Poland. The consequence of all this was a second partition of the Polish territory in 1793; the small remaining part of Poland was subjected to every kind of vexation and of persecution, yet the spirit of patriotism was not quelled. An extensive conspiracy was organised. In 1794, Kosciuszko arrived at Cracow, assembled a number of peasants, and defeated a superior number of Russian troops. Warsaw rose against the oppressors. The Poles fought with that splendid valour for which they are so justly celebrated, but all their efforts proved unavailing against the overwhelming numbers from Russia and Prussia. Kosciuszko was defeated, wounded, and taken. The Russians committed atrocious massacres. Warsaw capitulated, and the remainder of Poland was divided in 1795 among Russia, Prussia, and Austria, being thus erased from the list of nations.

Russia, after having been exposed to a dismemberment by the invasions of the Poles and Swedes, who each aspired to seat a prince of their own nation on the throne of the czars, had given the reins of government to Michael Romanow (1613), a descendant, by the female line, from the house of Rurik, and his posterity is still reigning over the gigantic empire of the North. The Russian nation had received a character of servility and passiveness from the long domination of the

Mongols, enhanced also by a natural absence of activity and moral energy, as well as the principles of submission exacted by the Greek church ; and those characteristics still distinguish them. The authority of the sovereign was practically unlimited, and later his absolutism became a right. A nobility existed, but the nobles themselves gave the example of a blind obedience to the will of the prince. The court of Russia was quite Asiatic. Frequent revolutions took place, but revolutions of the palace. At no time, and nowhere in Russia, was seen the dawn of that progress engendered by morality—a general tendency to ameliorations, which is so often manifested and imposed by public opinion. Public opinion has never existed in Russia, and every material progress has always been effected in spite of the people, and against the people. With the accession of the line of Romanow, the history of Russia assumed a new character, and the nation occupies a conspicuous rank among European states. The long reign of Michael afforded him time to restore his dominions from the depression caused by the late calamities. His son, Alexis, succeeded him when a minor (1645). His reign is chiefly filled by a contest of about ten years with the Poles, and a formidable rebellion of the Cossacks of the Don. He devoted his last years to internal improvements and the advancement of civilisation. At his death, in 1676, his eldest son, Feodor, succeeded him, and his short reign is remarkable for the first war between Russia and the Porte, and for the destruction at Moscow of all the charters and muniments of the nobility, who thenceforward took precedence according to military rank. Feodor left no issue (1782). His brothers Ivan and Peter were placed jointly on the throne, under the guardianship of their elder sister, Sophia. The failure of two expeditions, and the attempt to exclude Peter from the government, brought on a revolution (1689). Sophia was sent to a monastery, Ivan abdicated, and Peter, one of the most remarkable men of modern times, ascended the throne as sole sovereign.

Peter the Great was the creator of the Russian influence in

Europe. He reformed the army—travelled in Europe—acquired practical knowledge—invited artisans and engineers to Russia—destroyed the turbulent militia of the Strelitz—and then commenced his work of regeneration. His great object was, to extend the frontiers of his empire—to obtain some ports on the Baltic—to introduce all the resources that civilisation had created in the West—and, at the same time, to concentrate and strengthen the sovereign authority. He succeeded in all. He founded schools, manufactories, printing-presses, hospitals, universities. He created the Russian navy, commerce and legislature; the city of St. Petersburg was raised after incredible efforts and sacrifices, to make Europe understand the new direction taken by the Russian polity. He, in the meantime, waged war in Asia, extending his authority as far as the Caucasus. We have seen his contest with Charles XII. of Sweden. Peter the Great died in 1725. The reigns of his successors, Catharine I., Peter II., Ivan III., and Anne II., were signalised by fortunate wars against Turkey, and internal intrigues and revolutions of the palace. A daughter of Peter the Great, Elizabeth, was still living; she was proclaimed empress by the guards in 1740, and the Russian government acquired some stability. The marriage of her sister with Peter of Holstein, and the family alliances with Sweden and Denmark, contributed to the Russian preponderance in the North, which ascendancy was formerly exercised by Sweden and Poland. Elizabeth was succeeded by her nephew, Peter III. (1762), who irritated his subjects by the innovations which he attempted to introduce into the army and the church; his consort, Catharine, fomented the public discontent. After a reign of six months, he was dethroned, soon died in prison, and Catharine II. was unanimously called to the throne. This immoral and unscrupulous princess gave a fresh impulse to Russian policy, which from this time assumed the steadily aggressive character which it has ever since maintained. Catharine, a friend of the French philosophers—protector of letters, fine arts, commerce and industry—did nothing for the moral emancipation of her

people. Her reign is remarkable for two great facts, besides the continuation of the civilising system of the great Peter, viz., the partition of Poland, so instrumental in the greatness of Russia, and the pretensions of the Russian government in the East—above all, over Constantinople. The Russian armies, under Catharine, conquered Moldavia, Wallachia, Bessarabia, and Crimea, because the Porte had assisted the Poles. A Russian fleet even threatened Constantinople. The plague, dissensions, and the jealousy of the other powers, checked, it is true, the progress of the Russian arms, and a peace was concluded in 1774, by which the czarina restored all the conquered provinces. But a second, and afterwards a third, war broke out, and this time Catharine was hoping to reign over the Bosphorus; the peace of Jassy, however, in 1792, baffled her expectations. Russia, nevertheless, had a foot in the East, and another in the West, ready to fall with colossal force on either side. Catharine improved considerably the internal administration of the empire, promulgated a new code of laws, encouraged vast colonies, and witnessed with indifference the outbreak of the French revolution, being bent on riveting the chains of Poland, and afterwards on the extinction of Polish nationality. She died in 1796. The surname of *Great* has often honoured her memory. Let it be so, if it is the reward of mere acuteness, of boldness in accomplishing ambitious views, and of many useful reforms of administration; but when we contemplate that Messalina of the North, in her private and public life, with her dishonourable policy, heartless conduct—with her loathing display of an artificial civilisation—we believe that the epithet of *Infamous* would be more justly applied to that monstrous female sovereign. She has been said to have perfected the civilising labours of Peter the Great; but that civilisation was nothing more than an imitation of the material and external progress of Western Europe. Russia, as well as Prussia, was the imitator of France; and Prussia has returned to its pure Germanic spirit, and developed its Teutonic elements. Russia, in the nineteenth century, exhibits a similar re-action. That

colossal power is developing its Slavonic principles and nationality, but adhering more intensely than ever to those tacit and arrogant pretensions of an absolute sway over the East and the West.

We have terminated our sketches of the political movements and progress of Christian Europe. We must now dwell with the same brevity on the intellectual, moral and social history of Europe since the sixteenth century.

Modern history is distinguished by one great historical fact, namely, a prodigious intellectual development—indeed, a total renovation of science. The beautiful days of Christian art were gone by; theology and religious metaphysics soon ceased to captivate the human mind. With modern history commences the reign of science, and the time when the powers of reasoning were applied to the investigation of the physical world as well as to practical and social morality. The history of the intellectual progress of that period is a most complicated subject, whether its general causes, chief characteristics or innumerable results are studied. Its complete investigation would necessitate an analysis of the universal and private causes inherent in the times, and of the general advancement of humanity as well as of Christianity—an account of the partial influences of the *renaissance*, of Protestantism, of scepticism, and a full *exposé* of the philosophical systems, of the religious questions, of the moral and economical doctrines, and of the general progress of the natural and physical sciences. How infinitely vast is the subject! but our humble task is solely to exhibit succinctly the most important transformations.

At the close of the fifteenth century, an extraordinary activity was reigning in Europe. Bold investigations were remarkable everywhere. A general yearning for truer, more real science, was manifest. This movement continued during the greater part of the sixteenth century without results, owing to the absence of unity and method; a confusion also ensued, arising from the revival of the systems of antiquity, and the mystical philosophy so pregnant with fruitless efforts. In the mean-

time, however, new discoveries gave a fresh impulse to the human mind. Copernicus described the true system of the world. Kepler somewhat foreshadowed the discoveries of Newton. Tycho Brahe was collecting the most invaluable observations. Then came Lord Bacon, whose great genius dissipated the mists of error, and broke down the obstacles which impeded advancement in useful science. His works present an estimate on the actual attainments in all the sciences, a catalogue of the desiderata in each department, and a detail of the methods best suited to prosecute improvements and new discoveries. The world owes to Bacon the sure method of advancing in knowledge by experiment and the observation of nature, instead of system and conjecture.

Bacon, said Horace Walpole, has been the prophet of truths that Newton came to reveal to mankind. True; but between Bacon and Newton, a man arose who followed the track of Bacon, and inflicted a mortal blow on all systems—who created a new method and a general theory of the world: we allude to Descartes, who was the first to lay down the laws of motion, especially that all bodies persist in their present state of rest or uniform rectilineal motion, till affected by some force. It is well known that his doctrines were mixed with palpable errors. “The most erroneous part of his mechanical philosophy,” says Mr. Hallam, “is contained in some proposition as to the collision of bodies, so palpably incompatible with obvious experience, that it seems truly wonderful he could ever have adopted them. But he was led into these paradoxes by one of the arbitrary hypotheses which always governed him.” But he enlarged the circle of philosophy, purified its form, and substituted, through investigation, faith for authority. He proclaimed the evidence of instinctive reason to be beyond and above the evidence of the senses; he introduced clearness and precision in the reasoning powers, and opened a new path to modern philosophy. Hobbes and Gassendi, admitting the celebrated axiom, *Nihil est in intellectu quod non fuerit prius in sensu*, were the most ardent antagonists of Descartes, whose doctrine met also with many zealous

apologists. Mallebranche was one of the most celebrated followers of Descartes, to whose doctrine he added his own ideas; thus creating a new system—endeavouring to destroy the authority of the senses and the power of imagination, whilst his own imagination led him to a spiritualism inaccessible to human reason.

Galileo, in 1609, constructed telescopes, and discovered the satellites of the larger planets. Kepler investigated the laws which regulate the motions of the planets, and the analogy between their distances from the sun, and periodical revolutions. The discoveries in astronomy led to improvements in navigation, and a great advancement of geometry in all its branches. Napier, in 1614, abridged calculation by the invention of logarithms. The Torricellian experiments determined the weight of the atmosphere. In 1616, Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood. The Royal Society was incorporated in 1662. The Royal Academy of Sciences was instituted by Louis XIV. in 1666; and similar institutions were founded in most of the countries of Europe. In the end of the seventeenth century arose the immortal Newton, and Leibnitz, the universal genius. Newton had discovered, before the age of twenty-four, the theory of universal gravitation, a principle which solves the chief phenomena of nature, and connects and regulates the whole machine of the universe. His theory of light and colours is the foundation of the science of optics, and his *Principia* the basis and elements of all philosophy. Locke, his contemporary, investigated the operations of the human mind, examined the soul by attending to its operations, and has been *à priori* the founder of the sensualist school of intellectual philosophy. The general law discovered by Newton was applied to facts of details, and enriched with new observations by Halley, Euler, Herschel, Laplace, &c. In Germany, Puffendorf, Wolf and Budde, were celebrated. The former considered, with Grotius, sociability as the natural principle of rights and duties. Wolf systematized the doctrines of Leibnitz: he worked at a classification of the sciences, and contributed powerfully to the overthrow

of Aristotle. Budde was his antagonist, and was the originator of that eclecticism so general afterwards throughout Germany. In the middle of the seventeenth century appears the melancholy figure of Pascal, at once a mathematician, a moralist, and a writer of unparalleled acuteness. From the age of eighteen, Pascal never passed a day without bodily suffering and laborious study, thus continuing, in spite of fearful physical pain, his scientific investigations and religious meditations. His great object was to demonstrate that the proofs of Christianity are more real, sure and connected than any of those which have authority among men; but the last years of his life were consumed by the malady that sent him to his grave, and debarred him from raising that magnificent monument of human genius. The fragments that remain of it, however incomplete, present a series of thoughts, sublime, alike from the profoundness of the reasoning and the purity and eloquence of the language. Death came rapidly upon Pascal, but it appeared to him calm and pure, or like a ray of sunshine after a storm; he breathed his last, embracing a crucifix. His body was opened, and his intestines found mortified, his chest dried up, his liver decayed; thus this frail envelope perished; it had long been lingering in torture, but it had enclosed for some years one of the purest souls, one of the most sublime intellects, that ever appeared on earth.

Natural philosophy, chymistry, and natural history, also advanced rapidly, and especially during the eighteenth century. The theories on air, water, on acoustics and caloric, became the object of numerous and conscientious researches. Electricity, discovered at the end of the sixteenth century, was more particularly cultivated in the eighteenth, when the discoveries of Galvani, Volta and Franklin revealed a new order of electric phenomena. Electricity will undoubtedly offer the most marvellous scientific discoveries in the nineteenth century. Chymistry long remained buried under the confused masses of alchymy. It is one of the youngest sciences that has emerged from the obscurities and follies of the preceding ages. It enters into the details that affect most closely the material

interests of society. Chymistry, it is well known, has a vast influence over the augmentation and the perfecting of all the useful arts; agriculture, manufactures, every kind of industry, are daily enriched by its new discoveries. That science long remained bound down to a few erroneous generalities and details; it seemed destined to be enthralled by Stahl's theory, when Cavendish, Priestley, and Lavoisier, may be said to have created the science of chymistry, which has never ceased from that time to advance with amazing rapidity. Natural history had been extremely neglected until the sixteenth century, when the discovery of the new world seemed to give an impulse to that study by opening to the curiosity of Europe a new, unexpected, and extensive field. From that day a series of researches and discoveries placed natural history among the most profound and useful sciences. A classification was established. The great labours of Linnæus fixed the attention of all the botanists, and became the basis of their studies. That science, in the meantime, was cultivated by Buffon, who exhibited, in his *Natural History*, a penetration embracing at once the grandest conceptions and the most minute observations, a most vigorous intellect, and an elegant loftiness of style, that has remained as a most perfect model of French composition. Bonnet, by his physiological researches, and the first essays of comparative anatomy, was preparing in zoology the beautiful results of the nineteenth century: whilst Jussieu was immortalising himself in botany by his classifications. We cannot describe the progress of medicine. This science, like all the others, was fertile in new discoveries, but long deprived of general laws and real principles; it advanced, therefore, with various private hypotheses, and hence arose various medical systems. Anatomy, after Harvey, became a great field of study. Physiology was founded by Boërhaave, and his continuator, the great Haller. The medical history of the eighteenth century closes with the illustrious Sydenham, surnamed the Hypocrates of England. Such are the acquisitions which distinguish the Christian civilisation from any other that has preceded. The

practical results of science seem destined to engender a new industrial world; the military art and the navy are indebted to them for perfecting improvements. The invention of a multitude of new machines have prepared great modifications and complete revolutions in the economical position of nations. The pre-eminent discovery of the close of the eighteenth century is undoubtedly the invention of James Watt—steam applied to locomotion—the consequences of which, on the progress of civilisation, are incalculable, and may be infinite. It seems an instrument sent by Providence to hasten the Christian unity of Europe.

The richness of literature and the scientific progress left the fine arts in the shade. Architecture and painting never recovered from the decadence that commenced at the Renaissance. A few architects, during the reign of Louis XIV., have left some remarkable works of a transitory style. All that has been constructed afterwards consists in a servile, tasteless imitation. The art of painting never reproduced the *chefs-d'œuvre* of the two great masters of the sixteenth century, Raphael and Michael Angelo. Their followers, however, shed a great artistical lustre on the seventeenth century. Angelo de Caravaggio, the Caracci, Guido, Domenichino, Albano, are all characterised by a special genius. Salvator Rosa, with his wildness and originality, Claude Lorraine, with his suavity and peculiar freshness of colouring, nobly close the list. The Flemish school is justly illustrious for the artists whose names are known to all. Rubens may be admired in his glory at Antwerp. The portraits of his pupil Vandyck may be gazed upon incessantly, and the admiration will be unceasing. Rembrandt, Wouvermans, Gerard Dow, are also the glory of that school. During the eighteenth century the decadence of architecture and painting is universal; a few rare gleams illuminate but feebly the gloom. The musical art had long been honoured in Italy, and masterpieces were composed in that classical land of vocal music; whilst Germany soon became the fatherland of instrumental music. It seems during the eighteenth century to have attained its zenith of perfection

in the inspirations of Handel, Gluck, Mozart, &c., crowned, on the threshold of the nineteenth century, by Beethoven, the Shakspeare of music. The general culture of music as a moralising agency among the people at large will be one of the numerous characteristic features of the nineteenth century.

But the human intellect, the creating activity of the Christian spirit, has not been limited to the exploration of the facts belonging to physical nature; it manifested itself also with unprecedented fecundity in all the fields of literature. No period in history has exhibited such varied labours, such profound erudition, and literary richness. To mention here all the names only that deserve to be recorded, would be overwhelming this chapter with a dry nomenclature. The subject has been most ably treated by Mr. Hallam in his *Literature of Europe*; we refer to that invaluable work, and content ourselves with an outline of the characteristic features of the literary movement of this period.

The study of the languages and authors of antiquity, which began in Italy at the commencement of the sixteenth century, did not decline, but it changed its locality. During the seventeenth century, we find the Netherlands and France chief centres of these pursuits. The idea of the typic superiority of the ancients was predominant, but, gradually, the models of antiquity, however beautiful, gave way before the vitality of modern genius. Literature long remained a humble imitation, until, bursting its fetters, it turned with admirable vigour to national tendencies and vernacular inspirations. The literature of France during the seventeenth century is one of the great literary epochs of modern history. During the sixteenth century, its southern literature had borne the last fruits of the activity of the Middle Ages. The purely French literature was scarcely formed. The southern languages were reigning in the domain of the *belles-lettres*. In advancing in modern history, literature assumed a new form; and although the general taste was purified by the ascendancy of the classics, this omnipotent influence nevertheless restrained the new elements and the creating tendencies and

inspirations engendered by the Middle Ages. The development of the Christian spirit and influence was long checked, and only commenced a new era in the literary world with Milton and Klopstock. Poetry, especially in France, had more difficulty in shaking off the cold monotony of imitation ; while the prose, more genuine and free, could abandon itself to an unlimited development, and attained a high degree of perfection.

The French prose was constituted by Amyot and Montaigne ; Clement Marot had prepared the progress of poetry. After the first years of the seventeenth century, when Voiture and Balzac had purified the prose, and Malherbe impressed the indelible stamp of his genius on poetry, the magnificent literary epoch of Louis XIV. opens with the two greatest names of literary France—Corneille and Molière. It is also the great age of religious eloquence—that of Fléchier, inimitable for its suavity ; of Bourdaloue, of an incomparable vigour of reasoning ; and Bossuet, the eagle of Meaux, so powerful, at once analytic, profound, and persuasive, soars over all. Massillon applied his eloquence to the morality of Christianity, in preference to the dogma. Fenelon, with his loving soul, his universal genius replete with Christian tenderness, may well close such a list. But it is almost unnecessary to name all those who adorned the age of Louis XIV. ; they are familiar to most lovers of literature ; above all, the unrivalled Lafontaine ; the gentle Racine, who revived Euripides and Sophocles ; Boileau, who seems a compound of Persius, Horace, and Juvenal ; Rousseau, inspired by Pindarus ; and, on the other hand, the profound scholar, Arnauld, with his solitary companions of Port Royal. France was at that epoch certainly the admiration of the world, and was taken as a model by a large portion of Europe. England, in the meantime, produced in the seventeenth century, among a host of distinguished literary characters, two men who alone throw all other literatures of the ancients and moderns in the shade, and who, at the same time, stand like the radiant orb that vivifies all, and form an imperishable era, viz., Shakspeare, the fountain head of all that is great in dramatic literature ; and

above him, above all, as a moralising and civilising genius, the Christian Homer, Milton—a poet indeed, but also a perfect poem himself, namely, the realisation of all that is pure, virtuous, lofty, and beautiful.

Germany was not so rich. Her literature was almost dead since the sixteenth century ; buried with Hans Sachs, the last of the *Meistersingers*. It is filled during the seventeenth century by the popularity of the poet Opitz and a crowd of imitators. Opitz knew the taste of his time ; he flattered it, and became the favourite of the day ; he is now almost forgotten. Italy did not give any worthy successor to Tasso and Ariosto. Guarini, Tassoni, Felicaja, Marini, and others, were but a mediocre compensation for the past literary glory of Italy. In Spain the Don Quixote sprang up in 1605, which alone would suffice for her glory ; but the age was illustrated in the Peninsula by the prolific dramatists, Lopez de Vega and Calderon. Portugal had been immortalized by Camoens in the sixteenth century, and no longer appears afterwards in a literary as well as a political point of view. During the eighteenth century, the literature of France is absorbed by three men : Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau—to whom we may add the *Encyclopedists*. The former took the initiative in establishing the claims of the citizen, in proclaiming the rights of humanity ; the second battered the social edifice with scepticism, eloquence, and sarcasms ; Rousseau shook it, and prepared a revolution by a solemn appeal to the laws of nature. It is the period when the sensualist philosophy of d'Alembert, Diderot and Helvetius succeeded to the science of the soul ; and they certainly exercised a sad influence, and are generally considered as having also prepared the abyss in which their country was afterwards plunged. But the revolutionary storm once over, the atmosphere was purified. The philosophy of the soul—spiritualism—resumed its former ascendancy, and the social body revived, abounding with fresh vigour and renovated youth.

England, during the eighteenth century, could not be illustrated by greater literary treasures ; her poetry declined

through the influence of Pope, while her prose writers, philosophers and orators shed a great lustre on that age, the commencement of which is so justly famed as the age of Queen Anne; the English prose attained an unprecedented purity. The century commences with Addison, and closes with Gibbon, who unfortunately remained blind to the moralising power and civilising influence of Christianity, so much were his ideas absorbed by the majestic domination of Rome. French prose attained, also, the highest degree of perfection. Voltaire and Rousseau remain as the models of modern writers, who can mostly be traced, with a few exceptions, either to one or the other. Religious eloquence died away, but was replaced by the passionate oratory of the tribune. Italy, Spain and Portugal remained in a very secondary torpid literary rank. But with the nineteenth century seems to commence the literary era of the North; Sweden and Denmark are proud of a noble staff of historians and poets. Russia proclaims her national tendency by producing Russian historians and poets. Poland is perhaps the richest in poetical stores of all the members of the great Slavonian family. But let us not omit the grandest literary spectacle of the eighteenth century, viz., the literary regeneration of Germany. Hagedorn and Haller were the first to give the signal of the revolution, which received a powerful impulse from Lessing, and, after him, was completed by Herder, Klopstock, Wieland, and Burger, who prepared the celebrated epoch of Goethe and Schiller.

The church of Rome was no longer the director of nations. The pontiffs had vainly protested against the treaty of Westphalia, and all the European public acts which followed it. Confined to their own temporal states, they saw their political influence vanish gradually, and their moral and religious character was greatly impaired by the weakness of this declining position. In every country, the clergy, although still possessing great riches, was bowed down under the monarchical influence. After the sixteenth century the history of the church of Rome ceased to be intimately associated with the great social arts and movements, and became rather

the history of powerless pretensions, of Christian propagation and theological controversies. The struggles against Protestantism were most energetic during the seventeenth century. In France especially the efforts towards the consolidation and regeneration of the Roman faith were varied, numerous, and heroic. The discipline and regulations of the convents attained a degree of cruel austerity. The congregations of the softer sex rivalled the male associations; a multitude of females sank under their fanatic, austere penitences. At Port Royal were established the community of property, perpetual silence, nightly prayers, and incessant labour. A great progress in the religious assemblies of this period is found in the adoption of the principle, that passive contemplation and worship, however austere, do not suffice to keep the mind within the necessary limits, but that labour and activity are the true preservers and safeguards of the soul: hence, that amazing activity of all religious congregations and orders, in so many departments. St. François de Sales had founded the order of the Visitation, less rigid in its pursuits, and whose object was to prevent the religious exaltation. He thought that every Christian ought to pray by his works and by labour. Pierre de Bérulle founded the priests of the *Oratoire*, from whom no vows were required, but mere engagements. This foundation obtained an extraordinary success; a multitude of young people, colleges and schools, were entrusted to Bérulle, who was thus the founder of a great institute, with its ramifications, where some of the most celebrated men were educated. The congregation of Saint-Maur, which was joined by the French Benedictines, was also devoted to education and erudition. The world owes to that community the most invaluable historical and ecclesiastical collections. During this learned activity appeared the great missionary of the people, Vincent de Paul, who founded the Congregation of the Missions, whose members were to spread religious instruction in the most remote localities. He founded also the Order of the Sisters of Mercy or Charity—noble women who sacrifice themselves wholly to the service of the

sick! Thus the church of Rome was evincing a religious enthusiasm by her institutions and by her solicitude for education, Christian propagation, learned studies, erudition, and loving charity.

The church of Rome, under the pontificate of Gregory the Fifteenth, founded an institution for a general propagation, and for missions to be sent to every part of the world. The idea had been conceived and proposed by a celebrated preacher, Girolamo de Narni, who, from the holiness of his life, was highly revered. The Roman government took active measures to accelerate the activity and conquests of the new institution, and to restore to Papacy its former ascendancy. Monks and preachers of every order overran Bohemia, Austria, Moravia, Hungary, the Palatinate, Denmark, Norway, France, the Netherlands, and England. The conversions were innumerable. The Jesuits alone boasted having, in one year, brought back to the Roman tenets sixteen thousands souls in Bohemia. In the meantime, the missionaries from Rome wrought greater results and wonders, in North and South America, despite the violence and immorality of the Spaniards. They renewed, in the New World, the devotedness and martyrdom of the first Christian ages at Rome. Ranke, the historian of Papacy, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, gazes with unmixed admiration on their boundless activity. "Embracing," he says, "the whole world, their energetic activity penetrated at once into the Andes and the Alps, to Thibet, in Scandinavia, securing everywhere the favour of the authority of the state, in England as well as in China; and on this unlimited scene, you behold it everywhere youthful, vigorous, and indefatigable." During the thirty years' wars, owing to the victories of the Protestants, and also to the religious indifference of Pope Urban VIII., the progress of the Catholic church was arrested, and followed by a re-action. Its unity, which had contributed to its power, was followed by divisions; and here commences, more especially, the independence of the European governments with regard to Rome.

The question which divided to the highest degree the Roman Catholic world, was the dispute between the Jansenists and the Jesuits on the subject of grace—an infinitely small cause of ardent rancours. The Jesuits, by the laxity of their morality, their worldly intrigues and ambition, and their arrogance, provoked the violent opposition to their order which broke out in the very heart of the Roman church. The Jesuits were attacked on two points, which they professed dogmatically, and were assailed with an unparalleled energy. Jansenius, a subtle, penetrating, acute mind, led on the attack, having prepared himself by twenty years of study and meditation to the controversy; he had read, it is said, about thirty times the works of St. Augustine. Jansenius's doctrine was diametrically opposed to that of the Jesuits; he maintained that inward grace is the only agency that moves the heart of man; this grace, irresistible when it approaches, is invincible when fixed. Thus man does inevitably, although voluntarily, good or evil, as he may be influenced by *grace* or *cupidity*; and the will is necessarily led by whichever is the strongest; the two tendencies being like the scales of a balance—the one not being able to ascend without the other descending. Such is the groundwork of this doctrine with innumerable corollaries. It was hailed with extreme terror, as a complete destruction of Christian hope, justice of God, and human liberty. Thousands of volumes were written for and against. Those of Pascal have specially survived; he, as well as Racine and his friends of Port Royal, were the loftiest defenders of Jansenism. Finally, the doctrine of Jansenius was condemned by the Papal authority, its adherents persecuted, and Port Royal destroyed. The Jesuits triumphed; but their victory, in which they exulted, soon vanished. The general irritation against them had augmented since the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. They were violently expelled from Portugal, after an inquest relative to an attempt to murder the king; and the principal royal houses of Europe conspired against them: they were banished from Spain, Naples, and Parma, although the Pope resisted the urgent demands to

abolish their order. At last, in 1773, Clement XIV., by a memorable sentence, pronounced the extinction of the celebrated order, that had been fruitful of much that was great and good formerly : but afterwards of many evils and unchristian principles. From that period no great religious movement has taken place in the church of Rome. During the eighteenth century the general corruption re-acted upon the clergy ; but they passed through a deluge of blood during the French Revolution, which has cruelly purified the church of Rome. She has returned to many of her primitive virtues, and many of her members are now aiding the cause of civilisation with an enlightened zeal. Protestantism has also partially ceased to agitate the world, but it has split into many sects. In Germany, its alliance with philosophy has somewhat helped the pantheistical tendencies, instead of aiding in the religious perception, as in France. Let us hope and believe that union, toleration and harmony in religion, will be another characteristic of the nineteenth century. We see every symptom of that great progress, harbinger of so many others.

The progression of material interests and of commerce advanced along with the developments of science and letters. The Dutch, and afterwards the English, adopted a methodical system of colonisation. At the close of the eighteenth century, the English had established their sway over the whole Indian peninsula—from the frontiers of Persia to China, from the Indian seas to the mountains of Thibet. France never possessed a colonising genius, and her efforts in that direction have never been successful ; but, on the other hand, she evinced an early and surpassing activity in her manufactures. In the seventeenth century, those of woollen were unrivalled ; the cultivation of the mulberry, and the training of silk-worms, soon enabled that country to scorn the foreign silks ; her manufactures of glass, carpets, lace, tapestry, were multiplied, and were envied by the rest of Europe. England, however, through her native energy and commerce, was ever as superior to the rest of Europe, in point of material civili-

sation, as Europe to the other parts of the world. To the British empire seems to have been awarded all the powers of action—all the faculties and forces that have ever been wanting in the states of the continent, and for which Russia alone seems now to contend, but on principles of despotism and restrictions. In England, the knowledge and experience of public affairs made rapid progress; the respect and power of public opinion, above all, have been the instruments of her greatness. On the other hand, the developments of principles,—of ideals, of the intellectual faculties in the masses,—although perpetually checked by egotistical and unprincipled governments, have advanced, on the Continent, despite all obstacles, with grandeur; the speculative doctrines have developed themselves with more vigour; while the characteristics of the English nation, constantly manifested, have been good sense and practicability. Thus, the ferment and explosions of the Continent, in the nineteenth century may be fairly judged as inevitable, and the steady, plain, majestic progress of England, as a natural result of her characteristics.

We have spoken of the transient commercial greatness of Venice, Portugal, and Holland. Sweden, Denmark, and Russia, possess all the elements for commercial greatness and maritime power. The Danes—the former adventurous Northmen—with their abundance of timber, their old experience in braving the seas, and by their geographical situation, appeared destined to reign over the Baltic; but the characteristics of the people and the inferiority of their other resources were opposed to their commercial efforts in the West Indies, and an obstacle to any maritime ascendancy. Sweden, prouder and more energetic, has mixed too much in the European wars and politics,—thus exhausting her resources and brilliant faculties,—to attain any commercial and maritime greatness. Russia, since Peter the Great, concentrated every national faculty, every resource, to external aggrandisement. The Russian navy presents, at this day, a formidable spectacle, reigning with absolute sway over the Baltic and the Black Sea. While Russian commerce endeavours to monopolise the whole of

Asia, the Russian political system strains to infect the whole of Europe, the Russian armies are exterminating the mountaineers of Circassia, threatening Constantinople, and watching on the Chinese frontiers.

Germany, before the French Revolution, was confined to her internal resources, but advancing above all the nations of Europe in moral and intellectual development. Indeed, no great change has taken place since, with the exception of a general tendency to a German unity. The Austrian provinces were governed by a military and oligarchical despotism. In Prussia, an absolute military government ruled the country. Bavaria and Saxony were also governed by absolute dukes. In the small states some princes were seen, who sometimes distinguished themselves by a wise and liberal administration. The municipal governments of the free cities were abounding with abuses, and their institutions were contrary to the liberty of industry and commerce. In the Catholic countries—especially in Austria and Bavaria—the clergy exercised a very great influence, possessing the government of public education; and the church was not without influence in the Protestant states, and that influence was but too often incompatible with the spirit of the Reformation, and disgraced also by a total absence of liberal enlightenment and toleration. Nevertheless, the German *tiers-état*, being separated from the nobility by a much deeper and more impassable gulf than in France, had attained a high degree of civilisation, especially in the North. A multitude of universities and schools had been established, and had popularised every intellectual culture. There was nothing in Europe like the mental activity and the reading world of Germany. At the end of the 18th century, Germany counted 10,000 authors, among whom a vast number of historians, philosophers, poets, and grammarians, are still celebrated. The enlightenment and civilisation, therefore, were in opposition to the form of government as much as the political organisation was contrary to the Germanic interests. And when the French Revolution announced the great political reform of Europe, the cause of liberty was

hailed with enthusiasm from the Rhine to the Baltic, despite the league of the courts and princes ; but, as the principles of 1789 were trampled under foot, in a pool of blood, and afterwards the rights of nations violated by the despotic usurpations of Napoleon, Germany returned to her former anomalous state, from which it has finally been roused in 1848.

Spain remained wretched within—powerless without. The fair peninsula has never known the first elements of civilisation ; the internal commerce was fettered by arbitrary duties from province to province. No industry arose in a country favoured by all the gifts of nature. The manufactures of Valencia, Castille, and Andalusia, were mostly wrought by foreign hands ; the objects of luxury were of Flemish fabrication. Despite the fabulous mines of the New World, Spain was so poor that the administration of Philip IV. was reduced to the necessity of throwing into circulation copper coins, to which was assigned a value very nearly approaching that of silver. The great mass of the nation did not even know the comfort of household furniture. The depopulation has been so great in Spain, that the celebrated Ustariz, a statesman, writing in 1722, gave a census of seven millions only ; and he complains that, although the citizens were decreasing, still the number of monks remained the same. Superstition and the Inquisition—both an outrage to Christianity—have been in Spain mortal foes of social development, and of intellectual advancement. Some Spaniards have been eminent in literature and the fine arts ; but there has never been either a school, an epoch, or a general progression,—they have only been exceptions to the general torpor. The grandees alone displayed an unprincipled ostentation in family plate and in gambling, whilst the common comforts of life were unknown even to them. Society was a dead letter ; the female sex void of morality, of the commonest instruction, and kept in thralldom ; travelling in Spain was similar to that of the deserts of Arabia ; in short, pride, sensual love, and inertness, are the chief characteristics of the nation ; and these being blended with a hollow, ardent fanaticism, venting itself in idle prayers

and devotion, the civilisation of Christianity has never been comprehended by that nation whose object of activity may be called into question, even in the nineteenth century, although evincing a vague yearning for national progress.

And that other land—so lovely—where the flowers ever blossom—Italy,—rich in souvenirs of Roman grandeur,—the fatherland of liberty during the Middle Ages, and of the sublimest artistical works of human genius,—Italy remained, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a prey to depravation and to banditti. The Italian populations, like a flock of slaves, did not deserve the name of nations, and the individuals did not merit the name of men; whatever remained of virtue, genius, and taste, sunk, blighted by a pestiferous atmosphere of corruption. From the foot of the Alps to the extremity of the kingdom of Naples there was no order, no legal protection, although no country perhaps was, and is, so overpowered by a superabundance of laws as Italy. Banditti and *bravi*, namely, assassins, were masters of the country, and fled from province to province, protected by the aristocracy and the princes. The casual efforts of the pontiffs and of kings were of no avail. The people, encouraged by such an example, made a free use of the knife and dagger. Impunity was regularly organised—justice a powerless shadow. In short, the state of Italy during that period may be briefly summed up:—tyranny and slavery, assassination and depravation, insurrection and famine, plagues and abject ignorance,—such were the characteristics of the state of Italy during that period.

Switzerland, during the seventeenth century, presents only a dismal series of atrocities—the inevitable consequences of religious wars, and of internal dissensions; the civilisation of those beautiful valleys remained long buried under the ashes and ruins of the civil wars. During the eighteenth century, the picture of civilised Switzerland is not more cheerful. History turns away from that period when it is compared to the pure and heroic times of William Tell, or the immortal days of Morgarten and Sempach. That period is unworthy of

the attention of posterity. It is filled by the intrigues of foreign powers,—by venality, anarchy, grossness,—by the ignorance of democracy—the intolerable domination of the cities over the peasants—by the aristocratical tyranny of a stupid nobility over the citizens,—by the consequences of a complete disorganisation and of an incoherent and disunited federacy. Some historians have only seen, during the annals of this period, the industry of the cities, the peaceful life of the rural population, the permanent neutrality of the federacy during the European convulsions; they have eulogised the simplicity and frankness of manners, the liberty of actions; they have compared that period to the patrician days of Rome, or to Greece. Putting aside every partial exaggeration, we will say that there was an apparent truth in this. Switzerland was free, but fearfully divided—peaceful, but disgracefully ignorant; she was weak as a state, and of an insensible neutrality in all the contests of her neighbours. With the French Revolution, Switzerland entered also a new era, and, since that day, has taken an active part in all the European movements, and shared the general progress.

Holland is especially deserving of the attention of the student of history, as a state totally diverging from any other. It became powerful though possessing very little territory; it became rich, whilst formerly it could not have supplied the wants of a twentieth part of her inhabitants. It acquired a considerable position in Europe, through energetic efforts, at the extremity of Asia. Holland, after a forty years' war, obtained from the sovereign, the king of Spain, the recognition of her existence as an independent republic. Labour, courage, and sobriety, were the first guardians of that liberty; then, the citizens of those provinces were poor, but the state rich; afterwards, the citizens became rich and luxurious, and the state poor. Holland has declined. We have already alluded to the great commercial enterprises of that nation in India, Japan, Java, &c.; commerce and successful warfare were the source of fortune and glory. The toleration and mild government of Holland made that country the refuge of all those

who fled from the religious persecutions of Spain and France. Amsterdam became the commercial rendezvous of the world; and an immense system of canals and skilful embellishments have given to that city and to the other capitals of Holland a picturesqueness perfectly original and attractive. We have seen, however, this Dutch republic ready to annihilate the liberty for which so much blood had been shed, and instances of cruel intolerance among a people whose happiness and laws were founded on toleration; but evil will yet long remain mixed with good.

It cannot be expected that we should dwell on the material state of the various nations of Europe during the Middle Ages and since the sixteenth century. It would be a subject of interminable details, for which the student must turn to special works of political economy, and others, which will be found mentioned in a catalogue of historical works annexed to this volume. *The Pictorial History of England*, for instance, abounds with valuable researches on the material state of the people. In France, M. Alexis Monteil has devoted his life to a real history of the people: his *Histoire des Français des divers états* is unrivalled. We may admit, as a principle, that the material state of a nation proceeds progressively according to its intellectual and moral advancement; and that, with the exception of minor dissimilarities of taste and manners, the inventory of material comforts is pretty much the same in every country, at certain periods of moral and intellectual development. Despotism and absence of property in the masses have ever generated wretchedness among the people, and a total ignorance of self-respect and of human dignity. Property and liberty, on the other hand, have always and will eternally engender morality, intellectual and material progress; they are the primary agencies, the perfecting instruments towards that incessant progress revealed by the Gospels, and that future amelioration approaching to perfectibility, which is the natural aspiration of every true Christian.

The great epoch from which dates all the discoveries and

innovations is the sixteenth century : carriages appeared during that age, and had already attained a high degree of perfection during the seventeenth. According to Sauval, *omnibuses* had been established in Paris during the latter century, but did not succeed ! Post-offices were then finally organised. The art of printing—that unparalleled vehicle for the diffusion of ideas and knowledge—advanced rapidly. It was at the commencement of the seventeenth century that the custom of publishing various relations, or opinions on public affairs, arose at Venice : every week was published a sheet, called *gazette* (from the word *gazetta*, a small Venetian coin then current, and equivalent to about a farthing). That example was followed by all the great cities. The physician Renaudot established, in France, the first gazettes, in 1631, and obtained the privilege which long remained the patrimony of his family. Voltaire mentioned that London, in his time, had twelve *gazettes* per week, and, in stating it, he is filled with amazement at so extraordinary a fact. We cannot help adding, what would the philosopher of Ferney say now, if, like one of the seven sleepers, he could return, and be flung into one of the great news' rooms of London, Hamburgh, or Liverpool ? At the close of the same century, muskets with bayonets became in general use. Tea was introduced into Europe by the Dutch, in 1610, and from Holland into England sixty years after. One of the great scourges to morality and civilisation was the legal establishment of the lottery. The act, enacted by order of Louis XIV., and worded by the council of state, for installing that institution, is one of the most curious documents, illustrating the manner in which kings and governments will sometimes give a colouring of philanthropy and justice to the most outrageous and iniquitous deeds. This is a fragment of it :—“ His majesty having observed the natural inclination of most of his subjects to make use of private lotteries, and wishing to procure them an agreeable and commodious means of obtaining a *safe revenue* for the rest of their lives, and even *to enrich their families*, in giving to hazard, &c. &c., has judged proper to establish, at the town-hall of Paris, a royal lottery

of ten millions . . . !” It is well known how far the lottery and gambling-houses have been an offence to public morality, and what a source of misery and infamy they have been to thousands of families, whilst they enriched the royal coffers and corrupt governments. The enlightenment of the nineteenth century has banished the odious institution, and, in the few countries where it still remains, it is an object of reprobation among all honourable men.

We have attained the limits of our sketches. It only remains for us to contemplate briefly the spirit of the new age, and the character of the era to which we have brought our generalising ideas and political outlines. We are fully aware of their insufficiency; but, if they have the good fortune to establish something of a method for historical studies, and induce, from that very insufficiency, some readers to turn to able, original, and special works, illuminating fully the advancement and principles of Christian civilisation—the writer of this Epitome will be amply rewarded for his earnest, however feeble efforts. The more we advance, the more the progression is rapid. It is impossible to know what new resources, what new scientific powers, are destined to humanity in the future. The advancement of morality, liberty, of the laws, of physical and mechanical sciences,—in truth, of every department, have been so rapid and marvellous since the French Revolution of 1789, that they have outstepped every expectation, even the most grounded. But it must not be forgotten that the wonders of the nineteenth century—including the electric telegraph, the marvels of steam, the principles of free trade, the proclamations of liberty, the efforts for the education and elevation of the people, the greater toleration,—all, in fact, are the offspring of the labours of eighteen hundred years, during which tears and blood have been flowing in abundance,—but during which, nevertheless, the European nations have advanced incessantly, although irregularly at times—animated by the *intuition*, which must now be an *idea* and a religious conviction, that Jesus Christ has regenerated humanity, and pointed out to the decayed and languishing

populations of our world a new path—a new vitality, in which humanity has never ceased advancing since the great era. Every century, every period, has left to future ages a lesson—a new experience—additional warnings; for no trials, no sufferings, have been spared during the several phases through which the Christian societies have passed. During that long education which has left them more enlightened and better—rich, above all, in experience, in spiritualism, and in juster and more enlightened religious feelings, they have suffered much—and their sufferings are not yet at an end. Divine justice has passed over the crimes of nations; for nations, as well as individuals, commit errors and crimes; they also suffer and repent; they also have their moral and physical diseases, which enlighten and regenerate them.

FIFTH PERIOD.

The Fifth Period in the history of Europe is scarcely commenced, and the facts which announce it are cotemporaneous; we can, nevertheless, examine the general and special characters that distinguish it from the preceding periods. At the close of the eighteenth century, we behold the conclusion and consequence of the facts and progress accomplished during the preceding ages, and the social results of Christianity. The period which commences with the nineteenth century is characterised, we believe, by a new tendency, viz., the practical realisation of Christianity, and, along with it, its civil and political application. The French Revolution of 1789 closes the past, banishes all ancient ideas, as well as every institution opposed to its object; and, on the other hand, it opens the future, and lays the foundation of the new social edifice. The French monarchy had long moved in perfect

contradiction with the advancement of civilisation ; abuses and scandals were multiplied, despite their exposure by public opinion ; and then, after the foul abuse of authority, came the sanguinary abuse of liberty ; and, along with it, persecution. And was that a progress ? it may be asked. We do not hesitate to reply, *yes*, if that re-action of the most bloody days of the reign of terror, however atrocious and cruel, was a fatal, unfortunate necessity of our imperfect nature—*yes*, in short, if, *without it*, a progress and regeneration could not be hoped for. But it is just and indispensable to sever *ideas* from the *facts* which they may happen to give rise to, when the former are disfigured by human passions. Ideas must be separated from the facts which they fortuitously engender. Many of those who only behold in the French Revolution a fearful tissue of bloodshed, of massacre, and plunder, would pronounce it highly unjust to reprobate the Reformation and Martin Luther, because they were indirectly the cause of the atrocities and aberrations of Munster. Thus, in the same way as the Reformation, notwithstanding the desperate wars and massacres it engendered, forms a great era of progress in Europe, the French Revolution, with infinitely less destruction, is equally an era of beneficial movements, unparalleled in history. France had no fixed laws, no organised justice, no stable maxims, no rights recognised, and was waiting, breathless, for a constitution that promised a long happiness. In 1789 was traced and promulgated this first *declaration of the rights of man*, which opened for France and Europe a new era. By it the French nation declared, that men are born and remain free and equal in their rights ; that the principle of every sovereignty dwells in the nation ; that the free communication of thoughts and opinions is one of the most precious rights of man, &c.

To this *declaration* succeeded the constitution of 1791. The National Assembly, wishing to establish the French constitution on the principles she had recognised and declared, abolished irrevocably all the institutions that thwarted liberty and equality of rights. Therefore, no more peerage, nobility,

distinctions of orders, hereditaryship of functions, no more titles, no corporations or decorations, no more venality, no more privileges, no *jurandes*, no *mâitrisés* (guilds), no religious thralldom contrary to the laws of nature and to the constitution. And this constitution was accepted by Louis XVI., and it governed France until the 21st of September 1792. Afterwards came the too celebrated *Convention*, an assembly that solemnly and judicially assassinated the monarch and covered France with gore and ruins. Those excesses were the consequences of varied and fatal causes. The unfortunate Louis XVI., virtuous and moral, was surrounded by a corrupt court; his weakness made him yield to the unprincipled influences that surrounded him; and he allowed himself to be made the head of a vast treason against France: the people, now loose after so long an oppression, beheld with wrath a marked preference for the middle classes. The kings of Europe were preparing for war, and the French court conspired with them; the nobility had fled; the clergy, hostile to the civil constitution, naturally opposed the Revolution; in short, the new constitution, and its new idea, were threatened in every direction with destruction; and no effective measures were taken to give a legitimate direction to the tumultuous movements of the nation; hence endless difficulties and violences—an irreconcilable hatred between the court and the people; and when France declared war after the insolent menaces of Europe, the nation would not leave her resources and armies in the hands of a conspiring power. Royalty was abolished. And it must be added that the regenerating principles of the Revolution had been tarnished in their outward form by the philosophy of the eighteenth century. Scepticism disfigured the real sentiments and principles that called forth the Revolution; and a pure materialism actuated the leaders. Systematic errors and fallacies, scientifically propounded and proclaimed with a terrible earnestness, became, in the hands of a small school, the masters and directors of all the movements and yearnings of the credulous, delirious people, roused to an over-exuberant

life after a long torpor of oppression : the responsibility of their crimes belongs to a few individuals.

In 1792 the whole nation had not received the benefits of the new government ; the middle classes more especially struggled for their own exclusive enjoyment of liberty and its free exercise. The triumph of the middle classes became egotistical and oligarchical ; and in order to waive effectually the claims of the people, these were sent to the field of battle, and were thus debarred from any participation in the government, and from the rights conquered by all. The people, therefore, were mere instruments during all the phases of that great era, after having brought into dust the ancient fabric of tyranny and abuses, and while they were animated by a legitimate feeling of the unspeakable wrongs they had endured, and of their own rights according to all human principles. Two parties had arisen ; both composed of men immoral and corrupt ; the one endeavouring to check the revolutionary movement, at a time when its energy was still indispensable ; the other, eager to bring the revolution to the most sanguinary exaggerations. The latter proclaimed atheism, and sullied the metropolis with a multitude of abominations. The leaders of both parties were vanquished ; but what remained of them, survived and threw great obstacles to the proceedings of the Government. A law directed against them failed in its object, and the ultra-Republicans took advantage of it to sow terror among the people by the executions and cruelties that are a disgrace to that epoch. And afterwards, when the honest and sincere men of the Revolution, whose efforts had been directed towards republican morality and equality—who had overthrown atheism and repelled all sanguinary acts—when they wished to resume the reins of government, arrest the effusion of blood, and moderate the revolutionary movement, a general league of all shades of opinion was formed against them. The honest Republicans were vanquished, and their memory long remained charged with the iniquities that had been committed by the victorious party. The government of France fell after-

wards into the hands of men void of any convictions—who proved themselves destitute of principles and morality. Heads no longer fell on the scaffold; but now came a sort of systematic assassination; bloodshed in the streets ensued again, for the hopes of all the fallen parties had been revived. The *Directoire*, that succeeded the Convention, committed the same errors; composed, also, mostly of men without political principles and morality, it was constantly assailed by factions, and only subsisted by varied *coups-d'état*. The purest revolutionary characters—all that was lofty and great in the Revolution, had found a refuge in the camps; the republican armies acquired an immortal glory, and forced Europe to demand peace. The revolutionary principles were becoming more acceptable to the Continent; France was recovering some of her pure republican energy, when Napoleon, armed with his military renown and popularity, assumed the government. He became emperor, and covered his despotic throne with a mantle of civil equality and military glory; thus, the claims of the more numerous class of the nation—the people—their claims to industry, agriculture, instruction, commerce, morality, comfort, property—which are all the work of peace—in short, their claims to civilisation, were drowned in the clash of arms, and in an unprincipled warfare: he left France exhausted; and those twenty years of wonders and convulsions terminated in the treaty of Vienna. But the constitutional governments of Europe did not end. Despite the most implacable opposition, the germs and principles of the French Revolution have continued their silent, irresistible development, purified by the past vicissitudes. The present anomalous spectacle of confusion, hope, love, faith, resistance—all the present convulsions of states and empires—are the expressions, we believe, of a common idea—of a general conviction; it is an invincible truth, a social law, that penetrates into the hearts and minds of all classes, of all nations, tending to a reformation of societies and of legislation. The Christian world instinctively advances towards that renovation. It anticipates a future day, when, politically, humanity

will be placed above nationalities ; when, in legislation, man will be equal to man ; society something of a fraternal exchange of services and reciprocal duties, regulated and guaranteed by law ; and once more, when Christianity will be inherent in practical life and in legislation.

It is well known that the great obstacles to the more rapid progress of Christian civilisation at large, are those social blots in nations that affect so deeply the material state of the working classes at large, and leave them oppressed by famine and wretchedness. Our age is so fully impressed with that fact, that it is also characterised by a general solicitude on the subject. Numerous institutions, various doctrines and methods, are daily proposed, in order to ameliorate the condition of those who suffer, and save them from the corrupting monster—want, famine. Want, indeed, exercises an invisible tyranny, unknown, we believe, to that great number who only see the surface of things. Want is the tyranny that inevitably produces desolation, ignorance, crime, immorality, and many of the most acute pangs of the soul. Yet such is the social state of the larger portion of Europe, that justice protects that social state—although the social state does not yet protect the members of the community from the grasp of destitution, because of the absence of what has so justly been called *Christian Justice*. It is quite just for our security, that the poor wretch who is guilty should be punished ; but it is just also that we should not forget that he was born in the midst of despair and vice ; that his intelligence has ever remained in darkness ; that indigence has created awful temptations ; that he has never heard the voice of tenderness and love, never been taught the beauty of flowers and verdure, the surpassing grandeur of the sun ; that, having suffered from want, his soul and judgment have been perverted from the cradle, although he is our brother, and son of the same God, who is the father of all immortal creatures, however poor, suffering, weak, and ignorant. There remains, therefore, a greater social justice—a Christian justice—yet to be exercised—namely, the legitimate organisation of

societies after its eternal principles; and thus to allow *all* the members of a community and nation the full development of their faculties, moral, intellectual, and physical.

But as a general solicitude for the amelioration of the condition of the poorer classes is one of the characteristics of the nineteenth century—of the commencement of our Fifth Period in the history of European civilisation—we hope that all those efforts scattered in Europe, and every doctrine for that object, may soon form a Christian-social-eclectic. A government represents society, and is also, therefore, a moral being possessing a heart like the individual, and feelings of generosity, goodness and charity. Conscientious governments owe, therefore, to all a partial superintendence of their well-being, and of the development of their intelligence and morality. It is for the general interest of society and humanity, and this duty may even assume the formidable right of resorting to force for a good object. This, in truth, is a delicate point by which the solicitude of governments may incline to despotism. Thus, the most benevolent and Christian objects seem subject to that law adopted by so many, which places evil by the side of good, and which is often an iniquitous pretence for the best things in the world to be condemned, because of the abuses they may produce. To this may be applied the discouraging maxim, that the worst thing in the world is the corruption of that which is the best. Justice has often been a screen to iniquity, but justice, in its dry, judicial sense, is only an imperfect instrument or agency in the organisation of society. Christianity, in adding to it Charity, has imposed upon all governments a heavy responsibility. Charity, therefore, in a private point of view, and especially in governments, is one of the great principles of progression in Christian civilisation. Christian justice, it is now understood, must be the fundamental principle—expressive of the special mission of the state, which does not fulfil all its duties if they are confined to the protection of rights; it comprises something far greater than this, viz., to fulfil a mission of love and charity. Justice, in truth, in respecting the liberty of a man,

could conscientiously let him die from starvation ; but Christian justice, in order to save him morally and physically, will practise self-denial. The duties of civil charity, in their legitimate growth and development, are at once manifest and void of dangers ; they consist in the aid and protection that a government owes to the development of the intellectual life of all, because God has ordained that every intelligent nature should bear fruit—but they consist also in the aid and protection of the development of moral life, because man is also a moral being, and it is one of the conditions of his existence to aspire after virtue—finally in the prevention and punishment of accidental crimes, as well as a general protection to all the members of the community.

Various schools of political economy and speculative philosophy have concocted and expounded exclusive theories, in a great number of which the beautiful and simple principles of Christian civilisation are greatly disfigured. Adam Smith, for instance, admits of no other principle but the liberty of labour, thus reducing a government to the functions of a police magistrate ; on the other hand, of late years the systems of organisation have been carried to unfeasible extremes. Kant repels love, because of the possible invasion of mysticism ; he sacrifices charity to justice, as if the human soul and society were not vast enough to admit of both. Other doctrines have appeared replete with lofty views, excellent ideas, but mixed with a vast portion of inadmissible principles. Indeed, all the good that is to be found in the contemporary systems is impregnated with Christianity, or presents a reflection of some of the principles of Christianity. We may sum up the actual tendencies to social reforms by a few words ;—death to the heartless and absurd systems of monopolies, privileges, antagonism, and industrial feudalism ; and advancement of Christian justice, association, and harmony. Individually, Christianity must continue to soften our nature. The speculative goodness of the mind is not enough ; we must also watch and encourage that generous tenderness of the heart which, in warming the intelligence, illuminates it,

and augments its fertility. True Christian sensibility is vigorous, and resists the freezing contact of material activity ; it is blended with an imagination at once regular, delicate and vivid, which, through the attraction of the Beautiful, leads to truth quite as safely as pure reason itself.

Humanity, we have seen, in its transformations, has proceeded from revolution to revolution, advancing over ruins—yet still advancing. Humanity, like the universe, seems to exist only by death and destruction, but that death has only been apparent, since it ever contains the germs of a new life. Revolutions, considered in this point of view, no longer bring so much sadness among the friends of humanity, because, beyond the momentary destruction, they perceive a perpetual renovation—because, in beholding the most deplorable tragedies, they foresee the closing scene—because, in beholding the decline and the fall of a form of society, they firmly believe that the future form, whatever the appearances may be, will be superior to the preceding ones. The crises of humanity are ever announced by dismal symptoms and phenomena. The nations, losing the past, are uncertain about the confused future ; hence the tumultuous agitations of the soul, impatience, error, crimes. But, it will then be asked, is it a terrible necessity—is it a supreme and sovereign law, that evil be incessantly, irrevocably linked to good ? Our world, indeed, is the theatre of perpetual struggles. Truth seems nothing more than a flame burning eternally over ruins and tombs. In nature one species only lives, by the destruction of an inferior species. Our earth, scene of the fearful agitations of the living, is nothing but a mass of dust, ruins, and corpses, with a skin-deep surface of life ; nevertheless, and despite all those considerations, let us plunge into the depths of our conscience, under Christian inspiration, and there we shall hear the eternal protest proclaiming loudly that the necessity of evil is a falsehood—that evil is but a huge accidental blot that can be gradually washed away by the spiritual and moral ascendancy. Our dignity as men—our glory as Christians—consists in believ-

ing this with implicit faith, while our power and faculties enable us to prove it in practical life. Again, such is the privilege of man, created in the image of God, that he has faith in his own perfectible faculties, and in the final reign of Christian justice. Thus, Truth and the virtues of that noble family will not remain a flame eternally burning over ruins, and whose brightness can only transiently and partially be gazed on by humanity. No: the reign of Truth will come, and those men in the past ages gifted with lofty souls, who have proclaimed any truth, and have been its martyrs—will live in the hearts of a grateful posterity—noble subjects of contemplation—unparalleled moral lessons, which are one of the great privileges of History!

APPENDIX.

No. I.

To our minor observations on Dr. Strauss's work, we beg to annex here the learned dissertation on the subject, added by Mr. Milman to his first book of the *History of Christianity*.

"At the time when this part of the present work was written, the ultra-rationalist work of Professor Paulus, the *Leben Jesu*, (Heidelberg, 1828,) was the most recent publication. Since that time have appeared, the *Life of Jesus*, (*Das Leben Jesu*,) by Dr. D. F. Strauss, (2nd edition, Tübingen, 1837,) and the counter publication of Neander, *Das Leben Jesu* (Berlin, 1837); to say nothing of a great number of controversial pamphlets and reviews, arising out of the work of Dr. Strauss.

"This work (consisting of two thick and closely-printed volumes of nearly 800 pages each) is a grave and elaborate exposition of an extraordinary hypothesis, which Dr. Strauss offers, in order to reconcile Christianity with the advancing intelligence of mankind, which is weary and dissatisfied with all previous philosophical and rationalist theories. Dr. Strauss solemnly declares, that the essence of Christianity is entirely independent of his critical remarks. 'The supernatural birth of Christ, his miracles, his resurrection and ascension, remain eternal truths, however *their reality, as historical facts, may be called in question.*'* He refers to a dissertation at the close of his work, 'to show that the doctrinal contents of the *Life of Jesus* are uninjured; and that the calmness and cold-bloodedness with which his criticism proceeds in its dangerous operations can only be explained by his conviction, that it is not in the least prejudicial to Christian faith.' That dissertation, which opens (t. ii. p. 691) with a singularly eloquent description of the total destruction which this

* "Christi übernatürliche Geburt, seine Wunder, seine Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt bleiben ewige Wahrheiten, so sehr ihre Wirklichkeit als historische Facta angezweifelt werden mag.—Vorrede, xii.

remorseless criticism has made in the ordinary grounds of Christian faith and practice, I have read with much attention. But what resting place it proposes to substitute for Christian faith, I have been unable to discover; and must acknowledge my unwillingness to abandon the firm ground of historical evidence, to place myself on any sublime but unsubstantial cloud which may be offered by a mystic and unintelligible philosophy. Especially as I find Dr. Strauss himself coolly contemplating at the close of his work the desolating effects of his own arguments; looking about in vain for the unsubstantial tenets which he has extirpated by his uncompromising logic; and plainly admitting, that if he has shattered to pieces the edifice of Christianity, it is not his fault.

“But Christianity will survive the criticism of Dr. Strauss.

“I would, however, calmly consider the first principles of this work, which appear to me, in many respects, singularly narrow and unphilosophical—by no means formed on an extensive and complete view of the whole case, and resting on grounds which, in my judgment, would be subversive of all history.

“The hypothesis of Dr. Strauss is, that the whole history of our Lord, as related in the gospels, is mythic; that is to say, a kind of imaginative amplification of certain vague and slender traditions, the germ of which it is now impossible to trace. These myths are partly what he calls historical, partly philosophic, formed with the design of developing an ideal character of Jesus, and to harmonise that character with the Jewish notions of the Messiah. In order to prove this, the whole intermediate part of the work is a most elaborate, and it would be uncandid not to say a singularly skilful examination of the difficulties and discrepancies in the Gospels; and a perpetual endeavour to show in what manner and with what design each separate myth assumed its present form.

“Arguing on the ground of Dr. Strauss, I would urge the following objections, which appear to me fatal to his whole system:—

“First, The hypothesis of Strauss is unphilosophical, because it assumes dogmatically the principal point in dispute. His first canon of criticism is (t. i. p. 103), that wherever there is anything supernatural, angelic appearance, miracle, or interposition of the Deity, there we may presume a myth. Thus he concludes, both against the supernaturalists, as they are called in Germany, and the general mass of Christian believers of all sects in this country, that any recorded interference with the ordinary and experienced order of causation must be unhistorical and untrue; and even against the rationalists, that these wonders did not even *apparently* take place, having been supposed to be miraculous, from the *superstition* or ignorance of physical causes among the spectators; they cannot be even the honest, though mistaken, reports of eye-witnesses.

"But, secondly, The *belief* in some of those supernatural events, *e. g.* the resurrection, is indispensable to the existence of the religion; to suppose that this belief grew up, after the religion was formed, to assume these primary facts as afterthoughts, seems to me an absolute impossibility. But if they, or any one of them, were integral parts of the religion from its earliest origin, though they may possibly have been subsequently embellished, or unfaithfully recorded in the Gospels, their supernatural character is no evidence that they are so.

"Thirdly, Besides this inevitable inference, that the religion could not have subsequently invented that which was the foundation of the religion,—that these things *must have been* the belief of the first Christian communities,—there is distinct evidence in the Acts of the Apostles, (though Dr. Strauss, it seems, would involve that book in the fate of the Gospels,) in the apostolical Epistles, and in every written document and tradition, that they were so. The general harmony of these three distinct classes of records, as to the main preternatural facts in the Gospels, proves incontestably that they were not the slow growth of a subsequent period, embodied in narratives composed in the second century.

"For, fourthly, Dr. Strauss has by no means examined the evidence for the early existence of the Gospels with the rigid diligence which characterises the rest of his work. I think he does not fairly state that the early notices of the Gospels, in the works of the primitive fathers, show not only their existence but their general reception among the Christian communities, which imply both a much earlier composition and some strong grounds for their authenticity. As to the time when the Gospels were composed, his argument seems to me self-destructive. The later he supposes them to have been written, the more impossible (considering that the Christians were then so widely disseminated in Europe and Asia) is their accordance with each other in the same design or the same motives for fiction: if he takes an earlier date, he has no room for his long process of mythic development. In one place he appears to admit that the three first, at least, must have been completed between the death of our Lord and the destruction of Jerusalem, less than forty years. (I myself consider their silence, or rather their obscure and confused prophetic allusions to that event, as absolutely decisive on this point, with regard to all the four.) But is it conceivable that, in this narrow period, this mythic spirit should have been so prolific, and the primitive simplicity of the Christian history have been so embellished, and then universally received by the *first* generation of believers?

"The place, as well as the period, of their composition, is encumbered with difficulties according to this system. Where were they written? If all, or rather the three first, in Palestine, whence their general acceptance without direct and acknow-

ledged authority? If in different parts of the world, their general acceptance is equally improbable; their similarity of design and object altogether unaccountable.

"Were they written with this mythic latitude by Judaising or Hellenising Christians? If by Judaising, I should expect to find far more of Judaism, of Jewish tradition, usage, and language, as appears to have been the case in the Ebionitish Gospel; if by Hellenising, the attempt to frame the myths in accordance with Jewish traditions is inconceivable.* They Judaise too little for the Petrine Christians, (that is, those who considered the Gospel in some sort a re-enactment of the Mosaic law,) too much for the followers of St. Paul, who rejected the law.

"The other canons of Dr. Strauss seem to me subversive of all history. Everything extraordinary or improbable, the prophetic anticipations of youthful ambition, complete revolution in individual character, (he appears to allude to the change in the character of the apostles after the resurrection, usually, and in my opinion justly, considered as one of the strongest arguments of the truth of the narrative,) though he admits that this canon is to be applied with caution, are presumptive of a mythic character.

"If discrepancies in the circumstances between narratives of the same events, or differences of arrangement in point of time, particularly among rude and inartificial writers, are to be admitted as proofs of this kind of fiction, all history is mythic; even the accounts of every transaction in the daily papers, which are never found to agree precisely in the minute details, are likewise mythic.

"To these, which appear to me conclusive arguments against the hypothesis of Dr. Strauss, I would add some observations, which to my mind are general maxims, which must be applied to all such discussions.

"No religion is in its *origin* mythic. Mythologists embellish, adapt, modify, idealise, clothe in allegory or symbol, received and acknowledged truths. This is a later process, and addressed to the imagination, already excited and prepared to receive established doctrines or opinions in this new form. But in Christianity (according to Dr. Strauss's hypothesis) what was the first impulse, the germ of all this high-wrought and successful

"* Dr. Strauss, for instance, asserts all the passages relating to the miraculous birth of Christ (the first chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke), and those which relate his baptism by St. John, to have proceeded from two distinct classes of Christians, differing materially, or rather directly opposed to each other in their notions of the Messiah, a Judaising and an anti-docetic sect. See vol. i. pp. 446-448. We must find time not merely for the growth and development of both notions, but for their blending into one system, and the general adoption of that system by the Christian communities.

idealisation?—Nothing more than the existence of a man named Jesus, who obtained a few followers, and was put to death as a malefactor, without any pretensions on his part to a superior character, either as a divine or a divinely-commissioned being, or as the expected Messiah of the Jews. Whatever, extorted by the necessity of the case, is added to this primary conception of the character of Jesus, in order sufficiently to awaken the human mind to a new religion connected with his name, belief of his miraculous powers, of his resurrection, of his Messiahship, even of his more than human virtue and wisdom, tends to verify the delineation of his character in his Gospels, as the original object of admiration and belief to his followers; and to anticipate and preclude, as it were, its being a subsequent mythic invention.

“Can the period in which Jesus appeared be justly considered a mythic age? If by mythic age (and I do not think Dr. Strauss very rigid and philosophical in the use of the term) be meant an age in which there was a general and even superstitious belief in wonders and prodigies, mingled up with much cool incredulity, this cannot be denied. The prodigies which are related by grave historians, as taking place at the death of Cæsar; those which Josephus, who is disposed to rationalise many of the miracles of the early history of his people, describes during the capture of Jerusalem, are enough, out of the countless instances which could be adduced, to determine the question. But if the term mythic be more properly applied to that idealisation, that investing religious doctrines in allegory or symbol; above all, that elevating into a deity a man only distinguished for moral excellence (the deification of the Roman emperors was a political act), this appears to me to be repugnant to the genius of the time and of the country. Among the Jewish traditions in the Talmud, there is much fable, much parable, much apologue; as far as I can discern, nothing strictly speaking mythic. Philo’s is a kind of poetico-philosophic rationalism. The later legends, of Simon Magus, Alexander in Lucian, and Apollonius of Tyana, are subsequent inventions, after the imaginative impulse given by Christianity, possibly imitative of the Gospels.*

“I would be understood, however, as laying the least stress upon this argument, as this tendency to imaginative excitement and creation does not depend so much on the age as on the state of civilisation, which perhaps, in the East, has never become completely exempt from this tendency.

“But I cannot admit the spurious Gospels, which seem to me the manifest offspring of Gnostic and heretical sects, and to have

“* The nearest approach to the mythic, would, perhaps, be the kind of divine character assumed by Simon Magus among the Samaritans, and alluded to in the Acts.

been composed at periods which historical criticism might designate from internal evidence, though clearly *mythical*, to involve the genuine Gospels in the same proscription. To a discriminating and unprejudiced mind, I would rest the distinction between mythical and non-mythical on the comparison between the apocryphal and canonical Gospels.

“Neander, in my opinion, has exercised a very sound judgment in declining direct controversy with Dr. Strauss; for controversy, even conducted in the calm and Christian spirit of Neander, rarely works conviction, except in those who are already convinced. He has chosen the better course of giving a fair and candid view of the opposite side of the question, and of exhibiting the accordance of the ordinary view of the origin and authority of the Gospels with sound reason and advanced philosophy. He has dissembled no difficulties, and appealed to no passions. It affords me much satisfaction to find that, although my plan did not require or admit of such minute investigation, I have anticipated many of the conclusions of Neander. In many respects, the point of view from which I have looked at the subject is altogether different; and, as I have preferred to leave my own work in its original form, though some of the difficulties and discrepancies on which Dr. Strauss dwells may, I trust, be reasonably accounted for in the following chapters of my work, this will be only incidentally; the full counter-statement, prepared with constant reference to Dr. Strauss's book, must be sought in the work of Neander.

“It accords even less with the design of my work, which is rather to trace the influence and effect of Christian opinions, than rigidly to investigate their origin or to establish their truth, to notice the various particular animadversions on Dr. Strauss which might suggest themselves; yet I have added some few observations on certain points, when they have crossed the course of my narrative.

“The best answer to Strauss is to show that a clear, consistent and probable narrative can be formed out of that of the four Gospels, without more violence, I will venture to say, than any historian ever found necessary to harmonise four contemporary chronicles of the same events; and with a general accordance with the history, customs, habits and opinions of the times altogether irreconcilable with the poetic character of mythic history.”

No. II.

We must give here a fuller list of the barbarian laws. They were founded on ancient customs, and particularly designed to

repress the excesses of liberty and of mere individual force. They were approved in the general assemblies of the freemen, and modified afterwards with the same formalities; they were—

1st. The *Salic Law*, drawn beyond the Rhine before the Conquest, and a second publication of which, in Latin, is attributed to Clovis. The text we now possess of it is that of Dagobert and Charlemagne. It is generally believed that the Salic law excludes female succession from the crown of France. This conservative principle of the French monarchy is nothing but a derivation and arbitrary interpretation of an article of this code, in virtue of which “no portion of the Salic land can be inherited by females.”

2nd. The *Ripuarian Law*, similar to that of the Salian Franks, and promulgated by Thierry I., in a field of Mars, held at Châlons-sur-Marne.

3rd. The *Burgundian Law*, called also *Gombette Law*, from the name of Gondebaud, its first author, who had it accepted at the assembly of Ambérieux in 502. His son Sigismund gave a fuller edition of it in 517.

4th. The *Law of the Alemanni*, attributed to Thierry I., but in which the Christian spirit proves an origin not so ancient. It can at least be affirmed, that Dagobert had it revised in 630.

5th. The *Bavarian Law*, with the same origin as that of the Alemanni, and reformed under the same reign.

6th. The *Law of the Visigoths*, composed under Alaric II., in 506, by two jurisconsults, one a Goth, the other a Roman, with instructions to form a fusion of the national usages, the Theodorian code, and various collections of Roman jurisprudence. This code was finally terminated after many modifications, in 688.

7th. The *Law of the Ostrogoths*, consisting in a long edict of Theodoric enacted in 500, with the intention of submitting that nation to the Roman legislation.

8th. The *Lombard Law*, revised by Rotharis, who had it accepted at the diet of Pavia in 643, and considered by Montesquieu superior to all the codes of that period.

9th. The *Saxon Law*, work of Alfred the Great, from the legislation of the various princes of the Heptarchy.

All those codes intended for nations of the same origin are very similar to each other, as stated before. Most of them have the same characteristics which distinguish them from the ancient and modern legislation, namely, they were all, with the exception of the code of the Visigoths, personal and not territorial; they left to each the liberty of selecting the law which he wished to follow, and they gave the faculty of compensating all delinquencies with pecuniary fines. The Roman legislation exercised nevertheless, but indirectly, her influence on the barbarian society. Most of the articles of the Germanic codes relating to marriage, paternity, guardianship, or relating to property, such as wills, deeds, &c., came from the Theodorian juris-

prudence in the barbarian laws, through the medium of the canonical legislation.

No. III.

(a.) "On the whole, we will repeat that this religion of Mahomet's is a kind of Christianity; has a genuine element of what is spiritually highest looking through it, not to be hidden by all its imperfections. The Scandinavian God *Wish*, the God of all rude men—this has been enlarged into a heaven by Mahomet; but a heaven symbolical of sacred duty, and to be earned by faith and well-doing, by valiant actions, and a divine patience which is still more valiant. It is Scandinavian Paganism, and a truly celestial element superadded to that. Call it not false; look not at the falsehood of it, look at the truth of it. For these twelve centuries it has been the religion and life-guidance of the fifth part of the whole kindred of mankind. Above all things, it has been a religion heartily *believed*. These Arabs believe their religion, and try to live by it! No Christian, since the early ages, or only perhaps the English Puritans in modern times, have ever stood by their faith as the Moslem by theirs, believing it wholly, fronting Time with it, and Eternity with it." —*Thomas Carlyle, on Heroes and Hero-worship, Lecture II.*

(b.) "Society," says M. Guizot, "was then suffering from three vices—idleness, corruption, and wretchedness. Men being unoccupied, being perverted, and a prey to all sorts of sufferings, it was the reason for so many of them entering the monastic life. An honest, laborious, and happy nation, would never have adopted such a course. When human nature cannot follow the true object of her destiny, then her development becomes excentric, and, rather than accepting destruction and ruin, plunges at all risk into the strangest situations. In order to act and live in a regular, reasonable manner, humanity requires that the facts in the midst of which life and activity develop themselves, should be, in a certain measure, regular, reasonable; that human faculties should find employment in them, the condition of men should not be too hard, and the spectacle of corruption and general degradation should not bring indignation or discouragement in those energetic souls in which morality cannot grow cold. Ennui, the disgust of corruption, and the disposition to fly from the public miseries,—such are the causes which made the monks of the East, more than the particular characteristics of Christianity, or the excesses of religious effervescence. Those very same circumstances existed in the West; the Italian, Gallic, African societies, during the fall of the empire and the ravages of the

barbarians, were quite as wretched, quite as depraved and as inactive, as that of Asia Minor or Egypt. The true causes of the continuous extension of monastic life were therefore the same in the two countries, and were necessarily to produce the same effects."

No. IV.

(a.) "Ce qui fit le despotisme du Seigneur féodal," says Sismondi, "ce fut sa force; et si on peut s'exprimer ainsi, son invulnérabilité. La confiance de chaque gentilhomme dans la force de sa demeure, dans la bonté supérieure de son cheval et de son épée, de son armure défensive, développait en lui une valeur qu'on n'avait point aperçue tant qu'il n'avait eu aucun moyen de résistance. La vie d'un noble était tellement plus difficile à ravir que celle d'un plebeïen, qu'il s'accoutuma, et que chacun s'accoutuma comme lui, à l'estimer infiniment davantage. Soit même que cent bras se levaient contre lui, il était assuré qu'aucun ne pouvait l'atteindre; il ne lui restait plus qu'à faire en sorte que ses moyens de nuire fussent égaux à ses moyens de se défendre, et que son bras seul fut plus redoutable que les cent dont il bravait déjà les coups."

(b.) We could accumulate the proofs of the cruelty of Montfort, but a few will suffice:—He had ordered two Albigenses to be condemned to be burnt; the youngest of the two declared that he renounced the heresy; all implored his pardon; Montfort refused, giving this original reason: "If this man is sincerely converted, the fire will be an expiation for his sins; if he feigns to be so, he will suffer the penalty of his imposture." When Lavaur was taken, Montfort ordered the wife of the lord to be thrown alive into a well, the brother hung, eighty noblemen to be butchered in cold blood, and four hundred heretics to be burnt with great solemnity. Every day human victims were sacrificed; the few allowed to live were mutilated in order to be recognised; their noses and ears cut off, the wrists lopped off, and deep incisions on their lips and cheeks. That country so beautiful and opulent, the fatherland, as it were, of the troubadours and tournaments, with all its echoes repeating incessantly mirthful cheers and exquisite ditties, soon became a scene of devastation, with ashes, ruins, and blood, in the midst of which a mutilated phantom could occasionally be seen gliding, like a shadow from another world.

(c.) Those two idioms are subdivided to a great extent. The languages spoken in the south of Europe, and known by the

general denomination of *Romance* languages, are all the result of a mixture of a large portion of Latin with the northern idioms, also of the mixture of the races that had become Roman, with the Northern tribes, by which the Roman empire was overthrown. Fortuitous circumstances alone have engendered all the difference that exists between the Portuguese, Spanish, Provençal, French, and Italian. In all those languages the ground-work is generally Latin, whilst the form often possesses a character of barbarism. The conquerors introduced a great number of their words, but an infinitely larger number belongs to the conquered. M. de Sismondi has established that, in 871, the songs of the soldiers were still frequently in Latin; he mentions two, of one of which we give here a fragment:—

“Nos adoremus celsa Christi numina,
 Illi canora demus nostra júbila;
 Illius magna fisci sub custodia
 Hæc vigilantes jubilemus carmina
 Divina mundi rex Christe custodia.
 Sub tua serva hæc castra vigilia,
 Tu murus tuis sis inexpugnabilis
 Sis inimicis hostis tu terribilis:
 Te vigilante nulla nocet fortia
 Qui enna fugas procul arma bellica
 Cinge hæc nostra tu Christe munimina
 Defendens es tua forti lancea
 Sancta Maria mater Christi splendida
 Hæc cum Johanne Theotocos impetra
 Quorum hic sancta veneramur pignora
 Et quibus ista sunt sacrata mœnia,
 Quo duæ Victrix est in bello dextera
 Et sine ipso nihil valent jacula
 Fortis juvenus, virtus audax bellica.
 Vestra per muros audiantur carmina;
 Et sit in armis alterna vigilia
 Ne frans hostilis hæc invadat mœnia;
 Resultet echo comes: eja vigila.
 Per muros eja! dicat echo vigila!”

What a singular military eloquence! But the literary state was not so wretched, as soon as the poets were no longer obliged to have recourse to a foreign language for their national songs.

The Romance languages may be classed as follows: with the approximate period of the formation of each:—

Langue d'Oc, or Provençal	.	.	.	877 to	887
Langue d'Oil, root of the present French	.	.	.	917	943
Castilian	.	.	.	1037	1065
Portuguese	.	.	.	1095	1112
Italian	.	.	.	1129	1154

All the patois of the south of France are the wrecks of the *Romana rustica*. These dialects may be divided as follows:—The *Languedocien*, soft and euphonious, spoken in eleven departments; the *Provençal*, harsh and rapid, spoken in six departments; the *Dauphinois*, monotonous and dragging; the *Auvergnat*, also harsh and disagreeable; the *Limousin*, very shrieking and irregular.

The dialects, or patois, of northern France may be divided into four principal groups: the *Picard*, the *Flamand*, the *Normand*, and the *Wallon*; with other intermediary dialects more or less similar to any of those four.

(d.) The chase was the usual exercise, almost the only occupation of the nobility, when not engaged in warfare. The nobles often spent whole weeks in the forests with their officers, with no other object but the chase. It is well known that the feudal chase had a peculiar character, unknown before—the chase with the falcon. The falcon was trained to seize in the air the prey of the huntsman; that bird became so dear to the nobility, that the right of possessing one was considered as a prerogative. The favoured bird, adorned with bells and rings, was carried by the lords and ladies on their wrist, not only at the chase, but when out on visits, on pilgrimages, in the churches during divine service. The clergy would share with the nobility the honour of carrying a falcon, and they frequently had one on the pulpit while preaching, or perched on the corner of the altar during mass.

The falcon was so much respected, that the law which allowed a noble, when made prisoner, to give for his ransom all his gold, and as many as two hundred peasants of his estates, did not authorise him to recover his liberty in giving his falcon. Whoever stole a falcon was punished as if he had killed a slave. Many would be buried with this dear bird; sometimes it was left as a legacy to a best friend.

The ostentation and display in dress and equipage for hunting was extravagant and unbounded. After the contact with the earls, the nobles, devoted to bodily exercises, and as proud of physical strength as a gentleman would be now of a superior intellect—the nobles sent their vassals to Africa and to the North, to escort back, in cages, lions, tigers, and bears—and letting loose these animals in enclosures, they would throw themselves among them, and engage them in mortal combat—a mere game, but as dangerous as a bloody war.

The nobles were furiously jealous of the exclusive privilege of the chase; any infringement on these privileges led them to the most barbarous cruelty; in their eyes it was not so criminal to kill a man as to kill a stag or a wild boar. A bishop of Auxerre had a man crucified for having caused *innocently* the loss of a falcon that was being trained for the chase.—(See *Roux-Ferrand*.)

No. V.

(a.) We must explain here the meaning and etymology of the word *Saracen*. The name of *Saracen* (*Saraceni*, *Sarakenoi*), a name unknown to the Arabs, is given in common in the Christian Chronicles to the Arabs and Mussulmans, and also to the *Berbers*. The denomination of *Berber*, evident corruption of the word *Barbarus*, is given to the natives of the Atlas, from the frontiers of Egypt to the Strait of Gibraltar, and from the Mediterranean Sea to the land of the negroes. Before the Arabian invasion, the *Berbers* belonged, some to Judaism, some to Christianity, others to idolatry or the worship of fire. It was long after the complete submission of Africa that the whole race of *Berbers* embraced Islamism. It has been erroneously supposed that the Arab conquerors were all Mohammedans; far from it; they received in their ranks, Christians, Jews, Idolaters, all creeds. The language of the *Berbers* is still distinct from the Arabic, and is spoken from the ocean to Egypt. Beside the denomination of *Berbers*, which they received from the Arabs, and that of *Saracens*, they also give themselves the name *Amazyghs*, or nobles, corresponding to the *mazyre* given them by the Greeks and Romans. The etymology of the word *Saracen* has been much disputed; given to the Bedouins of Arabia, Petrea, and the Euphrates, it signifies the eastern (al Sharky) offering to the Bedouins of Africa; it more probably comes from the Arabic word *Suhrari* (pastor) from *Sahra*, country and desert, and not, as often said, from *Saraca*, to fly. It has been suggested that Bedouins might come from *Beda*, to live in the open air. Finally, under the ancient name of *Maures*, Moors are generally designated the inhabitants of the cities of the coast, the ancient *Mauritani* of Sallust. But the natives are ignorant of that name, as well as that of *Saracens* given them by the foreigners. They call *Kabayles* those addicted to a wandering life (from *Gabaily*, tribe), and call *Djebaly*, or mountaineers, the plundering and ferocious tribes who inhabit the mountains (*Djebel*, *Gebel*, mountains).

(b.) It was in the Sacred War that Frederic lost his life. He had led into Asia an army of 90,000 combatants, although he had removed from the military service all those who by their indigence would become burdensome. He had crossed Hungary and Bulgaria, and had rendered abortive the intrigues of the Greeks, who did not behold without mistrust his advancing into the centre of Romania. Nevertheless, he spent the first winter in Greece, and only crossed the Strait of Gallipoli in the month of March, of the year 1190. He subdued, afterwards, the Sultan of Iconium, who had resisted him and burnt his Capital. Already the army of Crusaders had reached the

campaigns of Armenia, inhabited by friends and christians, when, on the 10th of June, Frederic was drowned in the little river called *Jalef*, struck, it is said, with apoplexy, owing to the frozen temperature of its waters.—*Italian Rep. Sismondi*, vol. ii. p. 56.

(c.) The tragical end of Conradin, the last of the Hohenstauffens, is one of the affecting episodes of the history of the Middle Ages. He was brought, with his companions, into the market-place, opposite that lovely Bay which he had come to claim as his legitimate inheritance; the king, the court, and a vast concourse of people, filled the square. The consternation was general. When the judge read the sentence of death, Robert of Flanders, son-in-law to the king, Charles d'Anjou, rushed and stabbed him, exclaiming, "It is not becoming to thee, felon, to condemn so noble a lord." But the will of the king was inflexible. Conradin took off his cloak, knelt down to pray, then, on rising, he exclaimed, "Oh my mother, what sorrows I am causing you!" and, turning towards the people, he threw down his glove to the crowd, and it has been reported that he said at the same time, that he left his kingdom to whomsoever would avenge him. He laid his head on the stone block which is still to be seen in the church *del Carmine*, along with the pillar which had been raised to his memory at a later period, 1268. The friends of Conradin were beheaded after him, and all his partisans tracked, and slaughtered without mercy in Naples and Sicily. Thus ended the house of Suabia. It has been a popular belief in Italy, that Conradin's glove had been picked up by an old friend of Manfred, John of Procita, who afterwards became the indefatigable and ardent soul of the vast conspiracy that broke out in Sicily, on Easter Monday, 1282, at vesper time, when a general massacre of the French took place.

(d.) It is difficult, says William of Tyre, to give an idea of all the persecutions endured by the Christians. Among the instances of cruelty mentioned by the historians of the time, there is one which has given to Tasso the idea of his episode of *Olindo and Sophronia*. At this period, it seems, all the churches were converted into stables, that of the Holy Sepulchre totally destroyed, and the Christians, driven away from Jerusalem, were dispersed all over the East.

(e.) "The Anglo-Norman cathedrals were perhaps as much distinguished above other works of man in their own ages, as the more splendid edifices of a later period. Their science manifested in them is not however very great; and their style, though by no means destitute of lesser beauties, is upon the whole an awkward imitation of Roman architecture, or perhaps more

immediately of the Saracenic buildings in Spain, and those of the Lower Greek Empire. But about the middle of the twelfth century, this manner began to give place to what is improperly denominated the Gothic architecture, of which the pointed arch, formed by the segments of two intersecting semicircles, struck from points equi-distant from the centre of a common diameter, has been deemed the essential characteristic. We are not concerned at present to inquire, whether this style originated in France or Germany, Italy or England, since it was certainly almost simultaneous in all these countries; nor from what source it was derived; a question of no small difficulty. I would only venture to remark, that whatever may be thought of the origin of the pointed arch, for which there is more than one mode of accounting, we must perceive a very oriental character in the vast profusion of ornament, especially on the exterior surface, which is as distinguishing a mark of Gothic buildings as their arches, and contributes in an eminent degree both to their beauties and to their defects. This indeed is rather applicable to the later than to the earlier stage of architecture, and rather to continental than to English churches. Amiens is in a far more florid style than Salisbury, though a contemporary structure. The Gothic species of architecture is thought by some to have reached its perfection, considered as an object of taste, by the middle of the fourteenth century, or at least to have lost something of its excellence by the corresponding part of the next age; an effect of its early and rapid cultivation, since arts appear to have, like individuals, their natural progress and decay. Yet this seems, if true at all, only applicable to England, since the cathedrals of Cologne and Milan, perhaps the most distinguished monuments of this architecture, are both of the fifteenth century. The mechanical execution, at least, continued to improve, and is so far beyond the apparent intellectual powers of those times, that some have ascribed the principal ecclesiastical structures to the fraternity of freemasons, depositaries of a concealed and traditionary science. There is probably some ground for this opinion; and the earlier archives of that mysterious association, if they existed, might illustrate the progress of Gothic architecture, and perhaps reveal its origin. The remarkable change into this new style, that was almost contemporaneous in every part of Europe, cannot be explained by any local circumstances, or the capricious taste of a single nation."—*Hallam's Middle Ages*, vol. iii. p. 431.

(f.) We may quote among the *chefs d'œuvre* of the Catholic architecture, in France, the cathedral of Chartres, commenced in 1145; St. Denys, restored by Suger; Nôtre Dame, in Paris, began in 1163, and which took more than one hundred years to be completed; the beautiful Sainte Chapelle, raised by St. Louis (lately restored); the cathedrals of St. Ouen and Rouen,

Rheims and Toul; that of Strasbourg, especially, the work of Erwin of Steinbach, who had a hundred thousand men working successively under his orders. In England, Westminster Abbey, the cathedrals of Wells, Canterbury, Lincoln, York, &c. In Germany, the Cathedrals of Magdebourg (1207), of Cologne and Erfurt; those of Regensbourg, Nuremberg, Vienna, &c. &c. In Sicily and Italy, the religious buildings offer, generally, a mixture of the Norman, Greek, and Byzantine architecture, with a great deal of Saracen in Sicily. In Spain, the beautiful churches of Burgos, Toledo, and Seville, are of a somewhat later period, nor do these offer the pure style of Germany, France, and England.

(g.) The following account, by M. Sismondi, of Arnold's tragical end differs from most others, and we here transcribe it. "The king, in order to give the pontiff a first proof of his protection, ordered the count, who had given a refuge to Arnold, to be arrested, and he only released him when the latter had consented to give up the eloquent antagonists of the Popes into the hands of the prefect of Rome, an officer elected by the Pope, wholly devoted to the Pontiff. The people, yielding to the double terror of the spiritual thunders, and of the sword of a German army, made no effort to deliver the apostle of liberty who had been stigmatised by the sentence of a council, by declaring him a heretic. Before the Romans had time to recover from their surprise, the cruel vengeance of the Pope was accomplished. The prefect was dwelling in the castle of St. Angelo with his prisoner; one morning he had him taken to the square destined to the executions, before the gate of the people. Arnold de Brescia, placed on a huge funeral pile, was tied to a post, facing the Corso. He could see in one glance the three long streets which ended just before his scaffold, then embracing nearly half Rome; there were living the men whom he had so often called to liberty. They were reposing in peace, ignorant of the danger of their legislator. The tumult of the execution and the flames of the pile awoke the Romans; they flew to arms, ran, but too late; the guards of the Pope thrust away with their lances those who, not having been able to save Arnold, wished at least to collect his ashes as precious relics."—*History of the Italian Republics*, vol. i. p. 336.

No. VI.

(a.) Among all kinds of oppression and revolt, there exists a latent, but necessary, link ; it appeared very clearly in the affair of John Huss. Questioned on this article, "If a pope, a prelate, or a bishop, is in mortal sin, he is neither pope, prelate, or bishop,"—John Huss affirmed resolutely the truth of that principle, and, extending it to kings, he quoted the discourse of Samuel to Saul—"Because you have rejected my word, I shall reject you also, and you shall no longer be king." At this moment, adds the historian of the Council of Constance (Lenfant), the Emperor Sigismund was speaking near a window, with the elector palatine and the burgrave of Nuremberg. The cardinal of Cambrai had him called, and, having summoned him to repeat, in presence of Sigismund, what he had said, "Not content," he exclaimed furiously, "with degrading the priests, would you also degrade kings?"—a reproach, cruel and cowardly, but of a profound sense, more profound than was imagined by the cardinal himself.

John Huss had just done his duty ;—all that remained for him to do was to die. At the moment of the last and difficult trial he collected himself, and did not feel free of anguish ; the prison had weighed hard upon him ; he was ill ; he vomited blood ; nevertheless, he remained immovable. He was uselessly pressed to retract : he replied in the manner of those who know that their life belongs to their cause. He was condemned ; then, turning towards the Emperor Sigismund, he reminded him of the safe conduct, and, as he was fixing his eyes on the prince-traitor to his word, the latter could not stand such a glance, and a sudden blush covered his face.

John Huss had appealed to Christ, and the fathers of the council only laughed at him. In sign of derision, a mitre was placed on his head, on which was written, "*Heresiarch* ;" and he said, "I am proud to wear this crown of opprobrium, in memory of Jesus, who wore a crown of thorns." He was made to suffer many other humiliations. By an execrable refinement of barbarism, the fathers of the council had ordered that, on his way to the stake, his books should be burnt, in order that before abandoning his body to the executioners, he should witness the profanation of his thoughts. Arrived on the place of the pile, Huss fell on his knees, and exclaimed, "My God, I place my soul in your hands." And in the multitude there were many who were murmuring, full of admiration and pity, and exclaimed, "What crime has that man committed?" He was tied to the stake, his face towards the rising sun ; but some one having observed that he was not worthy of contemplating the east, as a heretic, he was turned towards the west. The fire was then

lighted, and the sublime aspirations of the martyr exhaled in Sacred Song in the midst of the flames. His ashes were thrown into the Rhine. But he was leaving avengers: he left heirs; and his touching prediction was to be accomplished: "other birds will rise, but who will rise swiftly above the snares of the enemies."—*Revolution Française, Louis Blanc*, vol. i. p. 22.

(b.) The trial was carried on before a tribunal composed of the enemies of Savonarola, and of judges deputed by the pope. They several times placed the monk on the rack. This man, whose constitution was feeble, and whose nerves were excitable, could not endure the tortures which he was made to suffer. To make them cease, he confessed that his prophecies were mere conjectures. But as soon as they wanted to write down his depositions without the rack, he again maintained the truth of his revelations, and of his whole predication. When the confessions that had been snatched from him by the torture were opposed to him, he replied, that they were the result of the weakness of his organs in enduring the excruciating torment inflicted; that as soon as they should begin them again, he felt that he should contradict himself;—that truth, however, only dwelt in the words he pronounced when pain and terror did not cloud over his mind. Then they made him endure new tortures, which made him pronounce new confessions—always disavowed and recanted afterwards; and the judges, not wishing to be exposed to a new derogation of his confession, did not require, according to custom, that his confession should be read before him, for him to acknowledge it publicly. During one month that Savonarola passed in prison, he composed a commentary on the *Miserere* (51st Psalm), which he had put aside when he wrote the exposition of the other Psalms, stating that he kept this work for the time of his own calamities. It is printed among his works. However, on the 23rd of May, a new pile was prepared on the same spot where his friend was to have entered the flames voluntarily. The three monks, Savonarola, Bonvicini, and Maruffini, having been degraded by the ecclesiastical judges, were tied to a stake. When it was declared to them that they were separated from the church, Savonarola only replied these words, "*Of the militating*,"—meaning, that from that moment he entered the triumphing church. He said nothing more. One of his enemies set fire to the pile, and anticipated the function of the executioner. Thus perished, between his two disciples, Savonarola, or Father Jerome, at the age of forty-five years and eight months. Strict orders had been given that their ashes should be collected and thrown into the Arno. However, several portions of them were stolen by the very soldiers who guarded the spot, and they are, at this very day, exhibited at Florence for the adoration of the devotees.—*Sismondi, Histoire des Républiques Italiennes*, vol. viii. p. 131.

(c.) The war between the English and French now became identified with the struggle between the Burgundians and the Armagnacs; the virulence of private animosities was thus added to the horrors of open war, and the atrocities committed on both sides were most fearful. One outrage, which excited great notice, may be briefly related as an illustration of the manners of the age. One of the most renowned captains in the Orleans faction was designated the Bastard of Vaurus; he had been originally in the service of the Count of Armagnac, and to avenge the death of his master, he practised the most unheard-of cruelties on all the Burgundians who fell into his power. An elm-tree near Meaux received his name, because he hung from it those victims who were unable to pay the enormous ransoms he demanded. A young farmer became his captive, and the Bastard put him to the torture; the wife of the prisoner, who had been about a year married, appeared before the barbarian, and besought mercy for her husband. The Bastard fixed an immense sum as the price of his liberation, and required that it should be paid before a certain day. Notwithstanding all her exertions, the unfortunate woman was a few days too late; she did not believe that Vaurus would execute his savage threat; she proceeded to Meaux, and tendered the ransom. Overwhelmed with anguish and fatigue, on her arrival before the Bastard she fainted, and when recovered, her first question was for her husband. "Pay the money," said Vaurus, "and then you shall see him." She did so, and was then informed with mockery that he had been hanged on the appointed day. Her shrieks and reproaches echoed throughout the city; the inhabitants were filled with horror; and the Bastard, indignant at her grief, ordered her to be stripped naked, and exposed under the tree where he was accustomed to hang his victims. The cruel orders were so frightfully obeyed, that the cords which bound her to the tree were so tightly drawn, as to cut through her flesh to the bone. The night on which she was thus exposed was dark and stormy; its terrors were heightened by the quivering of the corpses suspended from the tree, the feet of which frequently touched her head as the branches swayed in the wind. In this situation, she was seized with the pangs of premature labour; her cries of mortal agony were heard in the distant town, but no one dared to come to her assistance—so great was the dread of the Bastard. The wolves, which, in the distracted state of France, prowled everywhere through the country, soon got scent of their victim, and on the following morning she was found a mangled corpse, with the torn remains of her unborn infant by her side. The king of England, Henry V., besieged Meaux immediately after this awful tragedy; the defence was protracted for seven months, but it was at length taken by assault; the Bastard of Vaurus was hanged on his own tree, and several of his associates shared his fate.—(See *De Barante's History of the Dukes of Burgundy*.)

(d.) It has always been our conviction that Gerson was the author of the *De Imitatione*. Even Mr. Hallam, in his fair analysis of the claims of both Gerson and Thomas à Kempis, to the authorship of that celebrated work, produced arguments which always seemed to us in favour of Gerson; but the later researches of Messrs. Michelet and Ampère, and some manuscripts recently discovered in the archives of Valenciennes, leave, we believe, no doubt on the subject.

(e.) We must give this passage from M. Delécluze's charming history of Florence, in the original:—

“Florence! à ce nom, quel est l'homme doué d'un esprit noble, et tant soit peu cultivé qui ne se sorte vivement ému?— dont les rêves de gloire, de bonheur et de perfectibilité ne se réveillent pas dans sa mémoire? O vous qui, jeunes et tout gonflés encore de cette sève abondante d'idées, d'impression, de sentiments et d'espérances, sentez le besoin de vous nourrir d'images imposantes, de faits graves et de poésie, pour former votre jugement, pour régler les travaux de votre esprit et lester votre âme; allez à Florence! allez visiter ce sol glorieux baigné par le sang de ses enfants, embelli par le génie de ses artistes, immortalisé par le chant de son poète! allez voir ce coin de terre de notre Europe où les débris de la science, des arts et de la Philosophie Antique ont été sauvés du naufrage des temps barbares, où, une poésie et une langue ont éclaté tout à coup, où le flambeau de la Science pure a commencé à briller!”

(f.) Alfonso has kept in posterity the surname of Magnanimous, which he principally owed to an almost boundless liberality. In this age, when all the Sovereigns of Italy were rivalling each other in their love of letters, he equalled or surpassed them all, by his enthusiasm for the ancient classics, by his ardent love of study, by his munificence to the learned, whom he called around him from every direction, and whom he attached to his person, by magnificent rewards. He had taken for his crest a book open—and among those who were not, like him, administrators or warriors, never a Sovereign devoted more time to reading. He always carried with him a Livy, and the Commentaries of Cæsar; he always kept some books under his pillow, for the hours which could be stolen from sleep.—*Sismondi, Histoire des Républiques Italiennes*, vol. vi. p. 314.

No. VII.

(a) Henry, the third son of King John the Great, of Portugal, became the glorious protector of navigation, and placed himself at the head of the great movement of maritime investigations,

which brought his country to the high degree of prosperity and glory alluded to. Under his auspices, Zarco del Valle discovered, in 1420, the Island of Madeira, where the vine of Cyprus was transplanted, and is still the source of great wealth—and the sugar-cane, which was destined to enrich also a new continent; Gonzalès de Cabral found the Azores, which were destined to become a station for more distant explorations (1424); and Gilianez went to seek on the coast of Africa the promontory which the Carthaginian Hanno had not been able to pass, and which had been considered as the boundary assigned for ever to all navigators (1433). The discovery of the Cape Bojador came to exalt still more the imagination of Prince Henry. During the reign of his nephew Alonzo V., he established his residence at Sagre, in order to be better able to direct the maritime expeditions, and he founded a naval school at the Cape St. Vincent. From this college, no doubt, came the pilots who discovered, in 1460, the Islands of Cape Verde. Prince Henry launched the Portuguese nation in a career which they have pursued with an intrepid perseverance. A great nautical problem was to be solved, the solution of which was to change the commerce of the world. Diaz doubled the Cape of Good Hope in 1486, and showed to Vasco de Gama the road to India.

(b.) “In that strange island, Iceland, burst up, the geologists say, by fire from the bottom of the sea, a wild land of barrenness and lava; swallowed many months of every year in black tempest, yet with a wild gleaming beauty in summer-time; towering up there, stern and grim, in the North Ocean; with its snow-jokuls, roaring geysers, sulphur pools, and horrid volcanic chasms, like the waste chaotic battle-field of Frost and Fire;—where of all places we least looked for literature or written memorials, the record of these things was written down. On the seaboard of this wild land is a rim of grassy country, where cattle can subsist, and men by means of them and of what the sea yields; and it seems they were poetic men these, men who had deep thoughts in them, and uttered musically their thoughts. Much would be lost had Iceland not been burst up from the sea, not been discovered by the Northmen! The old Norse Poets were many of them natives of Iceland. Sæmund, one of the early Christian Priests there, who perhaps had a lingering fondness for Paganism, collected certain of their old Pagan songs, just about becoming obsolete then,—poems or chaunts of a mythic, prophetic, mostly all of a religious character: this is what Norse critics call the *Elder*, or *Poetic Edda*. *Edda*, a word of uncertain etymology, is thought to signify *Ancestress*. Snorro Sturleson, an Iceland gentleman, an extremely notable personage, educated by this Sæmund’s grandson, took in hand next, near a century afterwards, to put together, among several other books he wrote, a kind of Prose Synopsis of the whole Mytho-

logy; elucidated by new fragments of traditionary verse. A work constructed really with great ingenuity, native talent, what one might call unconscious art; altogether a perspicuous clear work, pleasant reading still: this is the *Younger* or Prose *Edda*. By these and the numerous other *Sagas*, mostly Icelandic, with the Commentaries, Icelandic or not, which go on zealously in the North to this day, it is possible to gain some direct insight even yet, and see that old Norse system of Belief, as it was, face to face. Let us forget that it is erroneous Religion; let us look at it as old Thought, and try if we cannot sympathize with it somewhat.”—*Thomas Carlyle, Hero Worship*, p. 24.

No. VIII.

(a.) We have already expressed our objection to the so general admitted expression, of *Gothic Architecture*, and we have often given to it the appellation of *Catholic*. Catholic certainly it was—and as much so as *ecclesiastical*, as it is also often called; for the secular edifices of the north of Europe were certainly the expression of a political Catholicism, but not ecclesiastical. However, we transcribe here the far-fetched reasoning of Frederick Schlegel, from his Essay on the *Principles of Gothic Architecture*—in which he argues for the preservation of the characteristic epithet of *Gothic*.

“I have a decided predilection for the Gothic style of architecture; and when I am so fortunate as to discover any monument, however ruined or defaced, I examine every portion of it with unwearied zeal and attention; for it appears to me that, from a neglect of such study, the deep meaning and peculiar motive of Gothic architecture is seldom fully arrived at.

“It unites an extreme delicacy and inconceivable skill, in mechanical execution, with the grand, the boundless, and infinite, concentrated in the idea of an entire Gothic fabric; a rare and truly beautiful combination of contrasting elements, conceived by the power of human intellect, and aiming at faultless perfection in the minutest details, as well as in the lofty grandeur and comprehensiveness of the general design.

“No art ought ever to be permitted to encroach upon its sister arts. The ancient classic monuments at Athens, Pæstum, and Girgenti, would undoubtedly, if seen in their native clime, excite feelings of veneration, in the same manner as the feeble designs and gigantic works of Egyptian, Persian, or Indian antiquity inspire wonder and astonishment. But what with us is usually styled Grecian art is merely a copy, a soulless imitation of the period when Greek art was in its decline, and an

agreeable but most unmeaning symmetry had replaced that grandeur of soul and expression which had too long been lost.

"The Gothic may possibly be styled in the next work on architecture the German style, from its having been common among all the nations of ancient Germany, and the grandest, heretofore called Gothic, edifices in Italy, France, and even in Spain, being also the work of German architects. This old Teutonic architecture certainly requires some effort of the mind to penetrate its unfathomable obscurity. It flourished most in the Netherlands, and appears to have attained there its highest perfection, scarcely a town in Brabant being without one or more remarkable monuments of that art.

"However, the general title of 'Gothic Architecture,' if that great national name be taken in its widest sense, for the old Christian and romantic style of the middle ages, from Theodoric down to the present time, is decidedly the most appropriate, and must ever be retained. I may remark also that the apparently arbitrary epithet of Romantic, applied to Mediæval poetry, so completely expresses the prevalence of fancy in that art, that it seems impossible to exchange it for any other term equally significant and appropriate.

"The Burgundians, Vandals, and some portion of the people of the Netherlands, having been originally Gothic tribes, that people may be considered founders of the Christian kingdoms of France, southern Germany, Italy, and Spain; whence, extending to the Scandinavian north, they took root in, and exercised domain over, the whole of the south of Russia, and the countries of Poland and Hungary. The term Gothic is, therefore, historically appropriate to that collective body of all nations who derive their origin from the same root as the Dutch and Germans. The Goths brought into Europe that overwhelming influx of German people and German ideas with which the history and social customs of the west, as well as the taste and style of its poetry, have ever since remained strongly imbued.

"The objections urged by some few critics to the use of the term Gothic, arise from an imperfect comprehension of its grand and universal signification. It may be possible to discover and explain the influence exercised by German genius on the works of other countries, but we cannot possibly call a style of architecture which flourished throughout all the lands once possessed by the Goths, from the most extreme east to the farthest west of Christendom, the German, as this exclusive epithet would only apply to that German fatherland which has been separated from the other states since the time of King Conrad, and would confine the term to boundaries much too limited; or, on the other hand, to call this peculiar style of architecture the Teutonic, would lead us too far back into antiquity, yet obscure as regards the art.

"The terms 'Old Saxon,' and 'Decorated Norman,' seem

very appropriately employed in England, as they indicate two grand epochs of the international history of that country, but they are not equally well suited to the rest of Europe. Old Saxon may, indeed, be applicable to Germany, in which country the rise of this peculiar style may be referred to the time of the old Saxon emperors; and also because Cologne, in which the most magnificent works of this as well as of a later period are to be found, was one of the most important towns of old Saxony. Still the epithet is too confined to apply to the whole Christian west comprehended under the Roman dynasty, and the greater part of which became German through the Gothic conquests.

"No particular examples are needed in support of the assertion, that the first rude elements of Christian architecture were of Greek or Roman origin. Still that redundant and vigorous fancy, which constituted the peculiar charm of Christian ecclesiastical architecture, is unquestionably Gothic.

"The rise of this principle, founded on a peculiar sentiment of nature pervading both architecture and all other imitative arts, is first found amongst the Goths, and from them it spread gradually on all sides, its progress and dominion being sufficiently attested by the architectural remains at Ravenna and elsewhere. Of the two epochs of Gothic art, one may properly be called early Christian, on account of the religious ideas therein developed; and the second, termed by the English, Decorated Norman, I should rather style Romantic, because every element of vigorous architectural fancy then first received its full development."

(b.) During the sixteenth century, the Elector of Saxony, Frederick the Wise, founded the University of Wittemberg in 1502. The Elector of Brandenburg founded that of Frankfort on the Oder; Cardinal Ximenes established in Spain the University of Alcala in 1517; Charles V. founded that of Seville, 1521, that of Compostelle in 1532 that of Oviedo in 1536, that of Grenada in 1537, that of Tortosa in 1540. The University of Strasbourg was founded in 1538, by the Senate of the city. The King of Denmark, Frederick I., founded that of Copenhagen in 1539, while the Pope Paul III. was founding that of Macerata in the march of Ancona. Albert I. founded the University of Konisberg in 1544. The King of Portugal, John III., founded that of Coimbra, in 1541. Como II. established the University of Florence in 1546; the Cardinal of Lorraine founded one at Rheims in 1547; while James VI. was re-organizing that of Glasgow. Charles V., who founded so many Universities in Spain, did not forget Sicily; one was created at Messina in 1548, and three years later the intellectual culture of Europe was introduced in the New World by the establishment of the Universities of Mexico and Lima.

(c.) The Council of Trent commenced in 1545; Pope Paul III. died in 1549, and the Council terminated in 1565, after having lasted sixteen years, and under five different Popes:—Paul II., Julius III., Marcel II., Paul IV., and Pius IV.

No. IX.

(a.) “At this time were first heard two nicknames, which, though originally given in insult, were soon assumed with pride, which are still in daily use, which have spread as widely as the English race, and which will last as long as the English literature. It is a curious circumstance, that one of these nicknames was of Scotch, and other of Irish origin. Both in Scotland and in Ireland misgovernment had called into existence bands of desperate men, whose ferocity was heightened by religious enthusiasm. In Scotland, some of the persecuted Covenanters, driven mad by oppression, had lately murdered the primate, had taken arms against the government, had obtained some advantages against the King’s forces, and had not been put down till Monmouth, at the head of some troops from England, had routed them at Botwell Bridge. Those zealots were most numerous among the rustics of the western lowlands, who were vulgarly called Whigs. Thus the appellation of Whig was fastened on the Presbyterian zealots of Scotland, and was transferred to those English politicians who showed a disposition to oppose the court, and to treat Protestant Nonconformists with indulgence. The bogs of Ireland, at the same time, afforded a refuge to popish outlaws, much resembling those who were afterwards known as Whiteboys. These men were then called Tories. The name of Tory was therefore given to Englishmen who refused to concur in excluding a Roman Catholic prince from the throne.”
—*Macaulay’s History of England.*

(b.) STATE OF THE PRINCIPAL POWERS OF EUROPE AFTER THE
PEACE OF UTRECHT.

ENGLAND.—1714-1727.—Accession of the House of Hanover. George I., exclusively in the hands of the Whigs. England’s power, on the ascendancy since the Peace of Utrecht, exercises great influence over Holland—the latter gradually declining.—FRANCE, 1715-1723.—Regency; alliance with England.—SPAIN,—1700-1746.—Philip V. He is at first governed by the Princess des Ursins, then by his second wife, Elizabeth of Parma. 1715-1719. Ministry of Alberoni.—AUSTRIA. 1711-1746.

Charles VI. The house of Austria considerably aggrandised, but not strengthened by the peace of Utrecht. Religious dissensions in the empire. War in Hungary and with the Turks.—All the Powers, excepting Spain, interested in the observation of the peace of Utrecht; during twenty years, they endeavour to continue it, by negotiation.—Vast plans of Alberoni.—His negotiation with Charles XII. and Peter the Great.—1717. Triple Alliance (France, England and Holland).—1717-1718. Sardinia and Sicily conquered by the Spaniards.—Conspiracy of Cellamare against the Regent.—1718. Quadruple Alliance (France, England, Holland, and the Emperor).—Spain obliged to join it.—1720. The Emperor renounces Spain and India; the King of Spain renounces Italy and the Netherlands; Don Carlos receives Tuscany and Piacenza as fiefs of the empire; Austria takes Sicily, and gives Sardinia to Savoy.—1721-1725. Congress of Cambrai; broken in 1725, because the French Minister sends back the Infanta of Spain to make Louis XV. marry the daughter of the dethroned King of Poland, Stanislas.—Peace of Vienna between Austria and Spain; defensive alliance, to which accede Russia and the principal Catholic States of the empire. Hanoverian alliance between France, England and Prussia, to which accede Holland, Sweden and Denmark.—Many causes prevent the general war ready to break out, viz., the death of Catherine I., Empress of Russia; the pacific character of the principal Ministers of France and England, Cardinal Fleury (1726-1743), and Robert Walpole (1721-1742).—Mediation of the Pope.—1728. Congress of Soissons.—1729. Peace of Seville (between France, England and Spain).—1731. *Treaty of Vienna*: England and Holland are guarantee for the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VI.; he renounces the trade of India through the Netherlands, and consents to the occupation of Parma and Piacenza by the Spaniards.—1733. Death of Augustus II., King of Poland. Two pretenders to the Crown: Augustus III., Elector of Saxony, son of the late King, supported by Russia and Austria; and Stanislas Leczinski, father-in-law of Louis XV., supported by France, allied to Spain and Sardinia. England and Holland remain neuter, despite their alliance with Austria. Stanislas is driven away by the Russians and Saxons; but France and Spain attack Austria with success. Occupation of Lorraine, capture of Kehl.—1734. The Empire declares against France. Capture of Philipsbourg. Conquest of the Milanese by the French and Sardinian armies. Victories of Parma and Guastalla.—1734-1735. Conquest of the Kingdom of Naples and Sicily by the Spaniards. Victory of Bitonto. The Infant Don Carlos crowned King of the Two Sicilies.—The arrival of ten thousand Russians on the Rhine, the mediation of the maritime powers, and the wish to confirm the Establishment of the Bourbons of Spain in Italy, despite the jealousy of England, deter-

mine the Cardinal Fleury to treat with Austria.—1738. *Treaty of Vienna*: Stanislas receives as compensation for his failure in Poland, Lorraine, which at his death is to go to France; Francis, Duke of Lorraine, son-in-law of the Emperor, receives in exchange the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, as fief of the empire (the last of the Medicis being dead without posterity); the Two Sicilies and the harbours of Tuscany are ensured to the Infanto Don Carlos (Charles III.); the emperor recovers the Milanese, Mantua, Parma, Piacenza. Navarre and Tortona remain in the hands of the King of Sardinia.

(C.) WAR OF THE SUCCESSION OF AUSTRIA, 1741-1748, AND SEVEN YEARS' WAR, 1756-1763.

The middle of the eighteenth century is marked by two European leagues, tending to the destruction of the two great Germanic powers. One of those powers, formerly preponderating, excites, by its weakness and helplessness, the ambition of the other States; the other, by its sudden elevation, excites their jealousy. Each engages the whole of Europe in the struggle; each defends itself with success, happily for the aggressors themselves, whose imprudence was on the point of breaking the continental equilibrium. The two wars are in reality but one, divided by a truce of six years. Although they both lasted the same number of years, the name of *seven years' war* has remained exclusively attached to the second.

WAR OF THE SUCCESSION OF AUSTRIA, 1741-1748.

Contradictory pretensions of the Princes allied against Austria. The King of Prussia alone knows what he wants, and gets it.—At first (1741-1744), the object is to annihilate Austria; then (1744-1745) to deliver Bavaria. Till 1744, Germany is the theatre of the war; Prussia and France are the principal actors against Austria. During the remainder of the war, France becomes alone principal actor, wages the war, especially in Italy and in the Netherlands. England supports Austria by her negotiations and by her arms; on this occasion she commences that system of subsidies by which she buys her paramount influence in the continental policy. Austria only loses three provinces, but is humiliated by the loss of Silesia, and cannot consent to the elevation of the King of Prussia, who is become with England the arbiter of Europe.—1740. Death of the Emperor Charles VI., last male heir of the Hapsburg family. This *Pragmatic Sanction*, guaranteed by the whole of Europe, ensures his succession to Maria Theresa, his eldest daughter, wife of the Duke of Tuscany, but to the prejudice of the daughters of Joseph I. The husbands of these princesses, Charles Albert, Elec-

tor of Bavaria, and Augustus II., Elector of Saxony, King of Poland, proffer claims to the succession of Austria. Philip V. of Spain claims Bohemia and Hungary,—Frederick II., of Prussia, a part of Silesia,—Charles Emanuel, King of Sardinia, the Milanese. France led by the Brothers Belle Isle, despite Fleury, supports the pretensions of those various powers. Maria Theresa is abandoned; England governed by Walpole has a war in Spain; Sweden, by the intrigues of France, has an unfortunate war against Russia.—1740-1741. Frederick invades Silesia, and gains the battle of Molwitz.—1741. The Elector of Bavaria and the French take higher Austria and invade Bohemia.—1742. The Elector of Bavaria, elected Emperor, under the name of Charles VII. Heroism of Maria Theresa. Devotedness of the Hungarians to her cause. She receives subsidies from Holland and England.—1742. Fall of the pacific Ministry of Walpole. Sardinia declares for Maria Theresa. An English fleet obliges the King of Naples to remain neuter. The mediation of England and the defeat of Czaslau decide Maria Theresa to yield Silesia to Prussia, whose King abandons the league; treaty of Berlin. The Elector of Saxony follows the example of Prussia.—1743. The *Pragmatic* army of George II. victorious at Dettingen; treaty of Worms between Maria Theresa and Sardinia. The French abandon Austria, Bohemia, Bavaria, and are repelled beyond the Rhine.—1744. France declares war against England and the Queen of Hungary. Union of Frankfort concluded between France, Prussia, the Elector Palatine, Hesse, and the Emperor, to enforce the recognition of the latter, and have him restored to his hereditary States. Frederic invades Bohemia. The French enter Germany. The Imperialists re-take Bavaria.—1745. Death of Charles VII. His son, Maximilian Joseph, treats with the Queen of Hungary. Francis I., husband of Maria Theresa, elected to the imperial throne.—Frederic of Prussia acquires the possession of Silesia by the victories of Hohenfriedberg, of Sorr, and of Kesseldorf; and by the invasion of Saxony, he forces the elector and the Queen to sign the treaty of Dresden. The French continue the war with success; in Italy, assisted by the Genoese, by the King of Naples, and the Spaniards; they establish the infant Don Philip in the Duchies of Milan and Parma; in the Netherlands, under the Marshal of Saxony, they gain the battles of Fontenoi and Raucou (1746).—1745-1746. Expedition of Charles Edward in Scotland; battle of Culloden.—1746. The French and Spaniards defeated at Piacenza. The Spanish army recalled by the new King, Ferdinand VI. The Austrians drive away the French from Lombardy, take Genoa, and invade Provence. The revolution of Genoa obliges them to recross the Alps.—1747. Conquest of Dutch Flanders by the French. The Stadthonderate restored and declared hereditary, in favour of William IV., Prince of Nassau. Victory of the French at Lawfeld, and capture of

Berg-op-zoom.—1748. The siege of Maestricht decides Holland and England to treat. France is induced to it, by the arrival of the Russians on the Rhine, by the destruction of her navy, and the loss of her colonies.—1748. Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. France, England and Holland restore their conquests in Europe, and in India; Parma, Piacenza, Guastalla, are given to Don Philip (brother to the Kings of Naples and Spain, and son-in-law to that of France). The *Pragmatic*, the succession of the House of Hanover in England and Germany, the possession of Silesia by the King of Prussia, are confirmed and guaranteed.

(d.) SEVEN YEARS' WAR, 1756-1763.

The jealousy of Austria, arms Europe against a sovereign who does not threaten the common independence. England struggles at the same time against France and Spain. Frederick II. and William Pitt conduct separately the continental war and the maritime war. Superiority of Frederick; his military genius; discipline of his troops; skill of his generals, Prince Henry, Brunswick, Schwerin, Seidlitz, Schmettau, Keith. Austria opposes to him, as Generals, Brown, Daun, Laudon; and as negociator, Kaunitz. France, in attacking England in Hanover, forces this kingdom and the neighbouring States to become the rampart of Frederick, and neglects the maritime war. The family compact formed too late to be useful to France. Frederick remains victorious in his struggle against Europe. Prussia exists and keeps Silesia. England attains her object, viz., the destruction of the maritime power of France. Frederick although weakened, always shares the first rank with England. But he does not wish for the continuation of the war, and the union of France and Austria promises a long peace to the continent. Misunderstanding between France and England.—1754. First hostilities in America.—1756. Alliance of England with Prussia, and of France with Austria. Projected partition of the States of the King of Prussia.—1756. The King of Prussia anticipates his enemies in attacking Saxony; he occupies Dresden, beats the Austrians at Lowositz, and at Pirna forces the Saxons to lay down their arms. France takes Minorca, and sends troops into Corsica; but she soon neglects the maritime war to attack England in Hanover.—1757. Success of the French. Victory of Hastenbeck. Convention of Closter-Severn. Sweden, Russia and the empire, join the league against the King of Prussia. Frederick enters Bohemia, gains the battle of Prague; he is repelled and defeated at Kolin. One of his generals defeated by the Russians at Yagerndorf. Danger of his position. He evacuates Bohemia, goes to Saxony, and defeats the French and Imperialists at Rosbach. Frederic returns to Silesia, and compensates the defeat of Breslau, by the victory of Lissa. He successively invades Moravia. Bohemia prevents the junction be-

tween the Austrians and Russians.—1758. He gains over the latter the long-disputed victory of Zorndorf. He is surprised at Hochkirchen by the Austrians.—1759. The Prussians defeated by the Russians at Palzig; by the Russians and Austrians at Kunersdorf; by the Austrians at Maxen. The victors do not take advantage of their successes. The Prussians beaten again at Landshut, are victorious at Leignitz and Torga.—1760. They retake Silesia, and again invade Saxony.—1758-1762. Disastrous campaigns of the French.—1758. Ferdinand of Brunswick having driven them out of Hanover, passes the Rhine, and gains the battle of Crevelt. The French occupy Hesse, and Ferdinand re-passes the Rhine.—1759. Victory of Broglie at Berghen. Defeat of the French at Minden.—1760. Victory of the French at Cloterscamp; self-devotedness of the Chevalier d'Assas.—1761. The French victorious at Grunberg; defeated at Fillingshausen.—1759. Death of the King of Spain, Ferdinand VI.; his brother Charles III., King of Naples, succeeds him, and leaves the throne of Naples to his third son, Ferdinand IV.—1761. The *family compact*, negotiated by the Duke of Choiseul between the various branches of the House of Bourbon, viz., France, Spain, Naples, Parma. Spain declares war against England and Portugal.—1760. Death of the King of England, George II. George III.—1762. Resignation of Pitt.—Death of Elizabeth, Empress of Russia. Peter III. Catherine II. recalls the Russian troops from Silesia, and declares herself neuter.—1762. *Peace of Hamburgh*, between Russia and Sweden. *Peace of Paris*, between France, England, Spain and Portugal. The King of Prussia, by the victory of Freyberg and the capture of Schweidnitz, decides the Empress Maria Theresa, and the King of Poland, Elector of Saxony, to sign the *Peace of Hubertsbourg*. The two last treaties restored everthing in Germany, precisely in the same state as before the war.



CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES.

ROMAN EMPIRE.

Augustus	31
Tiberius	A.D. 14
Caligula	37
Claudius	41
Nero	54
Galba	68
Otho	69
Vitellius	69
Vespasian	69
Titus	79
Domitian	81
Nerva	96
Trajan	98
Adrian	117
Antoninus Pius	138
Marcus Aurelius	161
Lucius Verus	161
Commodus	180
Pertinax and Julianus	193
Septimius Severus	193
Caracalla	211
Macrinus	217
Elagabalus	218
Alexander Severus	222
Maximinus	235
The Two Gordians	236
Maximus, Pupienus and Balbinus	237
Gordian, junior	238
Philip the Arabian	244
Decius	249
Gallus Hostilianus	251
Valerianus and Galienus	254
Galienus alone	260
Claudius	268
Aurelian	270

Tacitus	275
Florianus and Probus	276
Carus	282
Dioclesian	284
Dioclesian and Maximianus	286
Constantius, Chlorus and Gale- rius	304
Constantine I., the Great	306
Constantine II., Constans and Constantius	337
Julian	361
Jovian	363
Valentinian I. and Valens	364
Gratian and Valentinian II.	375
Theodosius I., the Great	379
Honorius (division of the Em- pire)	395
Valentinian III.	424
Maximus	455
Avitus	456
Majorianus	457
Severus	461
Anthemius	467
Olybrius	472
Glycerius	473
Julius Nepos	474
Romulus Augustulus	475
Extinction of the Roman Em- pire of the West	476

EMPERORS OF THE EAST.

Arcadius	395
Theodosius II.	408
Marcianus	450
Leo I., the Thracian	457

Frederic III.	1440
Maximilian I.	1493
Charles V.	1519
Ferdinand I.	1556
Maximilian II.	1564
Rodolph II.	1576
Mathias	1612
Ferdinand II.	1619
Ferdinand III.	1637
Leopold I.	1658
Joseph I.	1705
Charles VI.	1711
Maria Theresa	1740
Francis I.	1745
Joseph II.	1765
Leopold II.	1790
Francis II.	1792

ENGLAND.

Alfred the Great	872
Canute the Great	1017
Harold II.	1066
William the Conqueror	1066
William II.	1087
Henry I.	1100
Stephen of Blois	1135
Henry II.	1154
Richard I.	1189
John	1199
Henry III.	1216
Edward I.	1272
Edward II.	1307
Edward III.	1327
Richard II.	1377
Henry IV.	1399
Henry V.	1413
Henry VI.	1422
Edward IV.	1461
Richard III.	1483
Henry VII.	1485
Henry VIII.	1509
Edward VI.	1547
Mary	1553
Elizabeth	1558
James I.	1603
Charles I.	1625
Commonwealth	1649
Charles II.	1660
James II.	1685
William and Mary	1689
Anne	1702

George I.	1714
George II.	1727
George III.	1760

FRANCE.

Clovis	496
First Partition	511
Re-union. Clotaire I.	553
Second Partition	561
Clotaire II.	613
Dagobert	628
Charles Martel	714
Pepin	752
Charlemagne	768
Lewis I.	814
Charles the Bald	840
Lewis II.	877
Lewis III.	879
Charles the Fat	884
Eudes	888
Charles the Simple	898
Raoul	929
Louis IV.	936
Lothaire	954
Lewis V.	986
Hugh Capet	987
Robert	996
Henry I.	1030
Philip I.	1060
Lewis VI. (Fat)	1108
Lewis VII.	1137
Philip II. Augustus	1180
Lewis VIII.	1223
Lewis IX. (Saint)	1226
Philip III.	1270
Philip IV. (Bel)	1285
Louis X.	1314
Philip V. (Long)	1316
Charles IV. (Bel)	1322
Philip VI.	1328
John	1350
Charles V.	1364
Charles VI.	1380
Charles VII.	1422
Lewis XI.	1461
Charles VIII.	1483
Lewis XII.	1499
Francis I.	1515
Henry II.	1547
Francis II.	1559
Charles IX.	1560

Henry III.	.	1574
Henry IV.	.	1589
Lewis XIII.	.	1610
Lewis XIV.	.	1643
Lewis XV.	.	1715
Lewis XVI.	.	1774

Gustavus III.	.	1771
Gustavus IV.	.	1792
Charles XIII.	.	1809

DENMARK.

SWEDEN.

Harald .	.	863
Erik .	.	933
Haguin I.	.	936
Erik IV.	.	964
Olaf .	.	995
Edmund (Amund)	.	1051
Stenkil .	.	1060
Stenkilson and Inge	.	1099
Philip .	.	1112
Inge II. .	.	1118
Ragvald .	.	1129
Sverker .	.	1138
Erik the Saint	.	1155
Charles VII.	.	1160
Canute .	.	1168
Sverker II.	.	1199
Erik XI.	.	1210
John .	.	1216
Erik XII.	.	1222
Valdemar .	.	1250
Magnus .	.	1276
Birger .	.	1290
Magnus II.	.	1319
Albert .	.	1363
Margaret .	.	1388
Erik XIII.	.	1396
Christopher .	.	1438
Charles VIII.	.	1448
Interregnum .	.	1470
John, of Denmark	.	1483
Christian II.	.	1513
Gustavus Vasa .	.	1523
Erik XIV.	.	1560
John III.	.	1568
Sigismund .	.	1592
Charles IX.	.	1598
Gustavus Adolphus	.	1611
Christina .	.	1632
Charles X.	.	1654
Charles XI.	.	1660
Charles XII.	.	1696
Frederic and Ulrica	.	1718
Frederic Adolphus .	.	1751

Sigurd .	.	794
Harderknut (Canute I.)	.	824
Gorm .	.	855
Harald II.	.	936
Sueno (Sven)	.	985
Harald III.	.	936
Canute (Knut) the Great	.	1016
Canute III.	.	1036
Sueno III.	.	1047
Harald IV.	.	1076
Canute IV.	.	1080
Olaf .	.	1086
Erik I. .	.	1095
Niels .	.	1105
Erik II. .	.	1135
Erik III.	.	1137
Canute III.	.	1147
Valdemar the Great	.	1157
Canute V.	.	1182
Valdemar II.	.	1202
Erik IV.	.	1241
Abel .	.	1250
Christopher I.	.	1252
Erik V. .	.	1259
Erik VI.	.	1286
Christopher II.	.	1320
Valdemar III.	.	1340
Margaret .	.	1375
Erik VII.	.	1412
Christopher III.	.	1438
Christian I.	.	1448
John I. .	.	1481
Christian II.	.	1513
Frederic I.	.	1523
Christian III.	.	1533
Frederic II.	.	1559
Christian IV.	.	1588
Frederic III.	.	1648
Christian V.	.	1670
Frederic IV.	.	1699
Christian VI.	.	1730
Frederic V.	.	1746
Christian VII.	.	1766
Frederic VI.	.	1808

POLAND.

Mieczislar	964
Boleslas I.	992
Mieczislar II.	1025
Anarchy	1034
Casimir I.	1042
Boleslas II.	1058
Ladislas (Vladislar)	1079
Boleslas III.	1102
Ladislas II.	1138
Boleslas IV.	1145
Mieczislar III.	1173
Casimir the Just	1177
Lessex I.	1194
Boleslas V.	1227
Lessex II.	1279
Ladislas III., Lokieck	1296
enceslas	1300
Ladislas IV.	1305
Casimir the Great	1333
Louis, of Hungary (Great)	1370
Ladislas Tagellon	1386
Ladislas VI. (III.)	1434
Casimir IV.	1445
John Albert	1492
Alexander	1501
igismund I.	1506
igismund II.	1548
Henry, of Valois	1573
Stephen Battory	1576
igismund III.	1587
Ladislas IV. (VII.)	1632
John Casimir	1648
Michael	1669
John Sobieski	1674
Frederic Augustus I.	1697
Frederic Augustus II.	1714
Stanislas Augustus	1764
First Partition	1772
Second Partition	1793
Third Partition	1794

RUSSIA.

Ruric	862
Ror	879
Vladimir the Great	980
Rongols	1224
Ran I.	1477
Ran II.	1533
Rdor	1584
Rris	1598
Rhe false Demitri	1601

Michael Romanow	1613
Fedor II.	1676
Ivan and Peter I.	1682
Peter the Great, alone	1689
Catherine I.	1725
Peter II.	1727
Anne	1730
Ivan III.	1740
Elizabeth	1741
Peter III.	1762
Catherine II.	1762
Paul	1796
Alexander	1801

POPES.

St. Linus	66
St. Cletus	78
St. Clement I.	91
St. Evaristus	100
St. Alexander I.	109
St. Sixtus I.	119
St. Telesphorus	127
St. Hyginus	139
St. Pius I.	142
St. Anicetus	157
St. Soter	168
St. Eleutherius	177
St. Victor I.	193
St. Zephyrinus	202
St. Callixtus I.	219
St. Urban I.	223
St. Pontianus	230
St. Anterus	235
St. Fabianus	236
St. Cornelius	251
St. Lucius I.	252
St. Stephen	253
St. Sixtus II.	257
St. Dionysius	259
St. Felix I.	269
St. Eutychianus	275
St. Caius	283
St. Marcellinus	296
Vacancy from	304 to 308
St. Marcellus	308
St. Eusebius	310
St. Melchιάdes	311
St. Sylvester	314
St. Marcus	336
St. Julius I.	337
St. Liberius	352
St. Felix II.	358

St. Damasus	366	Zachary	741
St. Syricius	384	Stephen II.	752
St. Anastasius I.	398	St. Paul I.	757
Innocent I.	401	Stephen III.	768
St. Zozimus	417	Adrian I.	772
St. Boniface I.	418	Leo III.	795
St. Cœlestinus I.	422	Stephen IV.	816
St. Sixtus III.	432	St. Pascal I.	817
St. Leo I. the Great	440	Eugene II.	824
St. Hilarius	461	Valentine	827
St. Simplicius	468	Gregory IV.	828
St. Felix III.	483	Sergius II.	844
St. Gelasus I.	492	St. Leo IV.	847
St. Anastasius II.	496	Benedict III.	855
St. Symmachus	498	Nicholas I.	858
Hormisdas	514	Adrian II.	867
St. John I.	523	John VIII.	872
Felix IV.	526	Marinus	882
Boniface II.	530	Adrian III.	884
John II.	533	Stephen V.	885
Agapetus I.	535	Formosus	891
Silverus	536	Boniface VI.	896
Vigilius	538	Stephen VI.	896
Pelagius I.	555	Romanus	897
John III.	560	Theodore II.	898
Benedict I.	574	John IX.	898
Pelagius II.	578	Benedict IV.	900
St. Gregory I. the Great	590	Leo V.	903
Sabinianus	604	Christopher	903
Boniface III.	606	Sergius III.	905
Boniface IV.	607	Anastasius III.	911
St. Deus-dedit	614	Landon	913
Boniface V.	617	John X.	914
Honorius I.	625	Leo VI.	928
Severinus	640	Stephen VIII.	929
John IV.	640	John XI.	931
Theodorus I.	642	Leo VII.	936
St. Martin I.	649	Stephen VIII.	939
St. Eugenius I.	654	Marinus II.	942
Vitalianus	657	Agrapit	946
Adeodatus	672	John XII.	955
Danus or Damnus I.	676	Leo VIII.	963
Agatho	679	Benedict V.	964
St. Leo II.	682	John XIII.	965
Benedict II.	684	Benedict VI.	972
John V.	685	Boniface VII.	974
Conon	686	Benedict VII.	975
Sergius I.	687	John XIV.	984
John VI.	701	John XV.	985
John VII.	705	John XVI.	985
Sisinnius	708	Gregory V.	986
Constantine	708	Sylvester II.	996
St. Gregory II.	715	John XVII.	999
St. Gregory III.	731	John XVIII.	1003

Sergius IV.	1009	Innocent VI.	1352
Benedict VIII.	1012	Urban V.	1362
John XIX.	1024	Gregory XI.	1370
Benedict IX.	1033	Urban VI.	1378
Gregory VI.	1044	Clement VII.	1378
Clement II.	1046	Boniface IX.	1389
Damasus II.	1048	Benedict XIII.	1394
St. Leo IX.	1049	Innocent VII.	1404
Victor II.	1055	Gregory XII.	1406
Stephen IX.	1057	Alexander V.	1409
Nicholas II.	1058	John XXIII.	1410
Alexander II.	1061	Martin V.	1417
Gregory VII.	1073	Eugenius IV.	1431
Victor III.	1086	Nicolas V.	1447
Urban II.	1088	Calixtus III.	1455
Pascal II.	1099	Pius II.	1458
Gelasius II.	1118	Paul II.	1464
Calixtus II.	1119	Sixtus IV.	1471
Honorius II.	1124	Innocent VIII.	1484
Innocent II.	1130	Alexander VI.	1492
Celestinus II.	1143	Pius III.	1503
Lucius II.	1144	Julius II.	1503
Eugene III.	1145	Leo X.	1513
Anastasius IV.	1153	Adrian VI.	1522
Adrian IV.	1154	Clement VII.	1523
Alexander III.	1159	Paul III.	1534
Lucius III.	1181	Julius III.	1550
Urban III.	1184	Marcellus II.	1555
Gregory VIII.	1187	Paul IV.	1555
Clement III.	1188	Pius IV.	1559
Celestinus III.	1191	Pius V.	1566
Innocent III.	1198	Gregory XIII.	1572
Honorius III.	1226	Sixtus V.	1585
Gregory IX.	1227	Urban VII.	1590
Celestinus IV.	1241	Gregory XIV.	1590
Innocent IV.	1243	Innocent IX.	1591
Alexander IV.	1254	Clement VIII.	1592
Urban IV.	1261	Leo XI.	1605
Clement IV.	1265	Paul V.	1605
Gregory X.	1271	Gregory XV.	1621
Innocent V.	1276	Urban VIII.	1623
Adrian V.	1276	Innocent	1644
John XXI.	1276	Alexander VII.	1655
Nicolas III.	1277	Clement IX.	1667
Martin IV.	1281	Clement X.	1670
Honorius IV.	1285	Innocent XI.	1676
Nicolas IV.	1288	Alexander VIII.	1689
Celestinus V.	1292	Innocent XII.	1691
Boniface VIII.	1294	Clement XI.	1700
Benedict XI.	1303	Innocent XIII.	1721
Clement V.	1305	Benedict XIII.	1724
John XXII.	1316	Clement XII.	1730
Benedict XII.	1334	Benedict XIV.	1740
Clement VI.	1342	Clement XIII.	1758

Clement XIV.	. . .	1769
Pius VI.	. . .	1776
Pius VII.	. . .	1800

SPAIN.

Destruction of the Kingdom of the Visigoths	. . .	712
Pelagus, King of Asturias	. . .	718
Fruela, King of Oviedo	. . .	757
Garcia, King of Navarre	. . .	857
Ordono II., King of Leon	. . .	914
Sancho the Great	. . .	1000

CASTILLE.

Ferdinand I.	. . .	1037
Partition of Castille	. . .	1065
Re-union under Alonzo VI.	. . .	1072
Urraca and Alonzo VII.	. . .	1109
Alonzo VIII.	. . .	1126
Sancho III., new Partition	. . .	1157
Henry I.	. . .	1214
Ferdinand, the Saint	. . .	1217
Alonzo V., the Wise	. . .	1252
Sancho the Great	. . .	1284
Fernando IV.	. . .	1295
Alonzo XI.	. . .	1312
Peter, the Cruel	. . .	1350
Henry, of Trastamarre	. . .	1368
John I.	. . .	1379
Henry III.	. . .	1390
John II.	. . .	1406
Henry IV.	. . .	1454
Isabella	. . .	1469

ARRAGON.

Ramiro	. . .	1035
Sancho I.	. . .	1063
Pedro I.	. . .	1094
Ramiro II.	. . .	1134
Petronilla and Raymond Be- renger	. . .	1137
Alonzo II.	. . .	1162
Pedro II.	. . .	1292
Jayme I.	. . .	1213
Pedro III.	. . .	1276
Alonzo III.	. . .	1285
Jayme II.	. . .	1291

Alonzo IV.	. . .	1327
Pedro IV.	. . .	1336
John I.	. . .	1387
Martin	. . .	1395
Ferdinand, the Just	. . .	1412
Alonzo V., the Wise	. . .	1416
John II., of Navarre	. . .	1558
Ferdinand, the Catholic	. . .	1479

SPAIN.

Charles I. (V.)	. . .	1516
Philip II.	. . .	1556
Philip III.	. . .	1598
Philip IV.	. . .	1621
Charles II.	. . .	1665
Philip V., of Anjou	. . .	1701
Ferdinand VI.	. . .	1746
Charles III.	. . .	1759
Charles IV.	. . .	1788

PORTUGAL.

Henry, of Burgundy	. . .	1087
Alonzo Henriquez	. . .	1112
Sancho I.	. . .	1185
Alonzo II.	. . .	1215
Sancho II.	. . .	1223
Alonzo III.	. . .	1248
Denis	. . .	1279
Alonzo IV.	. . .	1325
Pedro I.	. . .	1357
Ferdinand	. . .	1367
John I., the Great	. . .	1383
Edward	. . .	1433
Alonzo V.	. . .	1438
John II.	. . .	1481
Emmanuel	. . .	1495
John III.	. . .	1521
Sebastian	. . .	1557
Henry	. . .	1578
Spanish Conquest	. . .	1580
John IV., of Braganza	. . .	1640
Alonzo VI.	. . .	1656
Pedro II.	. . .	1683
John V.	. . .	1706
Joseph	. . .	1750
Maria and Pedro III.	. . .	1777
John VI., Regent	. . .	1799

ITALY.

Odoacer, King of Italy	476
The Ostrogoths—Theodoric I.	489
Conquest of Italy by the Greeks	554
Invasion of the Longobards	568
Charlemagne	773
Lothair, Emperor	840
Charles, the Bald	875
Guy of Spoleto	891
Lewis of Burgundy	899
Berenger of Frioul	906
Rodolph of Burgundy	921
Hugh of Provence	926
Lothair II.	931
Berenger II.	950
Otho the Great, Emperor	963
Robert Guiscard, Duke of Apulia	1059
Roger, Count of Sicily	1074
Roger II., King of the Two Sicilies	1130
William I.	1154
William II.	1166
Henry VI.	1190
Frederic II.	1192
Charles of Anjou	1266
Sicilian Vespers	1282
Charles II.	1285
Robert, the Wise	1309
Joan I.	1343
Charles Duzarro	1382
Ladislas	1386
Galeazzo Viconti, first Duke of Milan	1395
Joan II., Queen of Naples	1414
Savoy raised into a Duchy	1417
Alfonso of Arragon, King of Naples	1435
Francisco Sforzo, Duke of Milan	1447
Ferdinand I., King of Naples	1450
Alfonso II., King of Naples	1494
Ferdinand II.	1495
Frederic III.	1496
Ferdinand, the Catholic	1503
Alexander de Medici, first Duke of Florence	1532
Como, first Grand Duke of Tuscany	1537
Milan belongs to Spain	1540
Charles Emmanuel, Duke of Savoy	1580
Victor-Amedée I. of Savoy	1630

Charles-Amedée II. of Savoy	1638
Victor-Amedée II. of Savoy	1675
Duke of Savoy, King of Sardinia	1718
Charles-Emmanuel III. of Sard.	1730
Don Carlos, King of Naples	1735
House of Lorraine in Tuscany.	1737
Ferdinand IV., King of N.	1759
Victor-Amedée III., K. of Sar.	1773
Charles-Emmanuel of Sardinia.	1796
Victor-Emmanuel of Sardinia	1802

EMINENT MEN IN SCIENCES,
ARTS, AND LITERATURE.

	DIED.
St. Clemens of Alexandria	about 309
Origen	253
St. Cyprian	258
Arius	336
Eusebius	340
Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers	358
Donatus	360
St. Athanasius	371
St. Basil	379
Priscillian	384
Gregory Nazianzen	389
St. Cyril of Jerusalem	386
St. Ambrose	397
St. Chrysostom	407
St. Jerome	420
Pelagius	about 424
St. Augustine	430
Nestorius	438
St. Cyril of Alexandria	444
Eutyches	448
Agathias	about 460
Sidonius Apollinaris.	482
Proclus	485
St. Patrick	491
Salvian	484
Zozimus	501
Stobæus	508
Avitus	521
Boethius	526
Tribonianus	527
Tornandes	552
Procopius	565
Cassiodorus	562
Gregory of Tours	595
Augustine	605
Fortunatus	609
George Pisides	641
Callinicus	about 680
Bede	735
Damascenus	754

Paul Diaconus	799	Fust	1466
Alcuin	804	Æn. Sylvius	1468
Eginhart	842	Guttemberg	1468
Nennius	858	Chalcondyles	1470
Ado	874	Theod. Gaza	1478
Hincomarus	882	B. Platina	1481
Scotus Erigena	883	Pomponius Lætus	1490
Nicetas	about 900	Picus Mirandola	1498
Abbo	923	W. Caxton	1492
Eudes de Cluny	942	Savonarola (burnt)	1498
Luisprand	970	Marsilius Ficinus	1499
Will. of Spire	about 1080	Phil. de Comines	1509
Will. of Apulia	about 1080	Rob. Fabian	1513
Lanfranc	1089	Aldus Manutius	1513
Sigebert	1113	Bap. Mantuanus	1516
Will. of Malmsbury	about 1140	Raphael	1520
Abélard	1143	H. Boece	1520
St. Bernard	1153	Hen. Stephens, sen.	1520
Arnold of Brescia (burnt)	1155	Leonardo da Vinci	1520
Peter Lombard	1164	Alex. ab. Alexandro	1523
John of Salisbury	1185	Ulrich von F. Hutten	1523
Peter of Blois	1202	Melancthon	1523
Mat. Paris	1259	J. Froben	1527
St. Th. Aquinas	1274	Albert Durer	1528
Albertus Magnus	1280	Machiavelli	1529
Roger Bacon	1284	B. Donati	1530
Abulfaragi	1286	Sannazario	1530
Brunetto Latini	1295	Zwingle	1531
Cimabuc	1301	Ariosto	1533
Abram Ben Casa	1303	Corn. Agrippa	1534
Joh. Duns Scotus	1307	Sir Thomas More	1535
Jo. Fordun	1308	Erasmus	1536
Raymond Lulli	1316	Æobanus Hessus	1540
Joinville	1318	Guicciardini	1540
Dante	1321	Jo. Major	1540
Abulfeda	1345	Paracelsus	1541
Villani (John)	1348	Alb. Pigghi	1542
Petrarch	1374	Copernicus	1543
Villani (Math.)	1364	Clément Marot	1544
Boccaccio	1376	Martin Luther	1546
Mat. of Weston	1378	Trissino	1550
Wickliff	1384	Rabelais	1553
Froissart	1400	Ign. Loyola	1556
Gower	1402	Pet. Aretino	1556
Chaucer	1400	J. C. Scaliger	1558
Flamel	1409	R. Stephens	1559
John Huss (burnt)	1414	Calvin	1564
Chrysoloras	1415	Michael Angelo	1564
Alain Chartier	1420	Adrian Turnebus	1565
Walsingham	1422	Peter Ramus	1572
Gerson	1429	Hans Sachs	1576
Aretino (Leonard Bruni)	1444	Camoens	1579
Monstrelet	1453	Palladio	1580
Poggio of Florence	1459	G. Buchanan	1582

Bodinus . . .	1585	Labruyere. . .	1695
Ronsard . . .	1585	Racine . . .	1699
Paul Veronese . . .	1588	Dryden . . .	1700
Cujas . . .	1590	Locke . . .	1704
Montaigne . . .	1592	Bossuet . . .	1706
Torquato Tasso . . .	1595	Bayle . . .	1706
Henry Stephens, jun. . .	1598	Vauban . . .	1707
Spenser . . .	1598	Boileau . . .	1711
Tycho Brahe . . .	1601	Cassini . . .	1712
Giordano Bruno (burnt) . . .	1600	Fénélon . . .	1715
Justus Lipsius . . .	1606	Mallebranche . . .	1715
Jos. Scaliger . . .	1609	Leibnitz . . .	1717
An. Caracci . . .	1609	Addison . . .	1719
Is. Casaubon . . .	1614	Sir Chr. Wren . . .	1725
Et. Pasquier . . .	1615	Basnage . . .	1723
Shakspere . . .	1616	Wollaston . . .	1724
De Thou . . .	1617	Sir Isaac Newton . . .	1727
Sir Walter Raleigh . . .	1618	Daniel Defoe . . .	1731
Cervantes . . .	1616	Boerhaave . . .	1738
Napier . . .	1617	Montfauçon . . .	1741
Will. Camden . . .	1623	Halley . . .	1742
Mariana . . .	1624	Pope . . .	1744
Bacon . . .	1626	Swift . . .	1745
Malherbe . . .	1628	Barbeyrae . . .	1747
Kepler . . .	1630	Giannone . . .	1749
Davila . . .	1631	Lord Bolingbroke . . .	1751
Lopez de Vega . . .	1635	Will. Whiston . . .	1752
Campanella . . .	1639	Berkely . . .	1753
Ben Jonson . . .	1638	Sir Hans Sloane . . .	1753
Vandyke . . .	1641	Montesquieu . . .	1755
Galileo . . .	1642	Fontenelle . . .	1757
Bentivoglio . . .	1644	Dom. Calmet . . .	1757
H. Grotius . . .	1645	Harvey . . .	1758
Torricelli . . .	1647	Handel . . .	1759
Descartes . . .	1650	Christian Wolf . . .	1759
Balzac . . .	1654	Richardson . . .	1760
Gassendi . . .	1655	Dr. Leland . . .	1760
Nic. Poussin . . .	1656	Stephen Hales . . .	1761
W. Harvey . . .	1657	Dr. Bradley . . .	1762
Pascal . . .	1662	Hooke . . .	1763
Cowley . . .	1667	Ja. Anderson . . .	1764
Molière . . .	1673	Ed. Young . . .	1765
Milton . . .	1674	Laur. Sterne . . .	1768
Spinoso . . .	1678	R. Simson . . .	1768
Hobbes . . .	1679	R. Smith . . .	1769
Butler . . .	1680	Chatterton . . .	1770
Otway . . .	1680	Gray . . .	1771
Corneille . . .	1684	De la Condamine . . .	1774
Ducange . . .	1688	Oliv. Goldsmith . . .	1774
Cudworth . . .	1688	David Hume . . .	1776
Boyle . . .	1691	Haller . . .	1776
Puffendorf . . .	1694	J. Fergusson . . .	1776
Huigens . . .	1694	W. Bowyer . . .	1777
Lafontaine . . .	1695	Voltaire . . .	1778

Rousseau .	.	. 1778	Lessing .	.	. 1787
Linnæus .	.	. 1778	Sydenham .	.	. 1787
Earl of Chatham .	.	. 1779	Gainsborough .	.	. 1787
Warburton .	.	. 1779	T. Sheridan .	.	. 1787
Blackstone .	.	. 1780	Buffon .	.	. 1788
Metastasio .	.	. 1782	Mirabeau .	.	. 1789
D'Alembert .	.	. 1783	Joseph Vernet .	.	. 1789
Euler .	.	. 1783	Adam Smith .	.	. 1790
Dr. Johnson .	.	. 1784	Benjamin Franklin .	.	. 1790
Bishop Lowth .	.	. 1787	John Howard .	.	. 1790

HISTORICAL LIBRARY,

OR

CATALOGUE OF HISTORICAL WORKS,

Used in the Compilation of this Epitome, or which, in their respective Departments, may be referred to, consulted, and studied.

General History.

Universal Diplomatic Collection of the International Laws, from the Time of Charlemagne. By J. Dumont. (French.—Amsterdam and the Hague, 1726, and following. 8 vols. fol. Supplement 3 vols.)

Byzantine History. By Dufresne Ducange. (Latin.—Paris, 1680. 2 vols. fol.)

History of the Jews. By Basnage. (French.—The Hague, 1716. 15 vols.)

Excellent work of reference.

General History of the Huns, Turks, &c. By Deguignes. (French.—Paris, 1756. 5 vols.)

History of Treaties until Charlemagne. By Barbeyrac. (French.—Amsterdam, 1739. 2 vols. fol.)

Collection of the principal Treaties since 1761. By Martens. (French.—Gœtt. 1791, and following. 19 vols. with Supplement.)

History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. By Gibbon.

That celebrated work will ever remain the most invaluable connecting link between ancient and modern history; with the reserve of his antichristian representations and occasional impure insinuations, few works of equal aim and compass can be compared to it.

History of Treaties of Peace. By Schœll. (French.—1817. 15 vols. 8vo.)

Course of History of the European States, since the Overthrow of the Roman Empire to 1789. By Schœll. (French.—1830. 46 vols. 8vo.)

Historical Manual of the Political System of Europe and its Colonies. By Heeren. (German.—2 vols. translated into French, 1821; in English, 1 vol. 1846, Oxford.)

Lectures on Universal History. By John von Müller. (German.—Tubingen, 1819. 3 vols.)

Placed in the first rank for industry of research and accuracy of narration.

Historical Criticism. By John von Müller.

Manual of Universal History. By Leo. (German.—2 vols. 1839.)

History of the Lower Empire. By Lebeau. (French.—29 vols. 12mo, 1751.)

Manual of the History of the Middle Ages. By Fr. Rühs. (German.—Vienna, 1817. 2 vols. 8vo.)

Manual of the History of the Middle Ages. By Rehm. (German.—8 vols. 1824, and following, 8vo.)

A work celebrated in Germany, as an excellent collection of facts and details.

Manual of Universal History. By A. Ott. (French.—2 vols. 1842.)

A good work, despite several errors, and which has been of great use to us; but written in a Roman Catholic spirit that often impairs the impartiality of the author.

Introduction to the Science of History. By T. A. Buchez. (French.—2 vols. 8vo. 2nd edit. 1842.)

Also a work in that exclusively Roman Catholic spirit, but singularly profound as well as mystical, and beautifully written.

History of the Middle Ages. By Kortum. (German.—Bern. 2 vols. 1839.)

History of the European States. By Spittler. (German.—2 vols. 8vo. Berlin, 1823. French translation in 1824.)

Abridgment of the General History of Modern Times. By Ragon. (French.—3 vols. 8vo. 1834.)

Good work, used in the University of France, but somewhat partial to Gallo-Roman tendencies.

History of the Middle Ages. By Desmichels. (French.—2 vols. 1836.)

A most excellent work in every way, but unfinished.

Europe during the Middle Ages. By Henry Hallam. (3 vols. 1824, London.)

Justly celebrated for its impartiality and learning.

Supplemental Notes to the above Work. (1 vol. 1848.)

General History of the Treaties of Peace since the Peace of Westphalia, comprising the Labours of Koch and Schœll. By Count de Garden. (French.—20 vols. 1846.)

Useful compilation.

History of the Progress of Civilisation in Europe. By Roux-Ferrand. (French.—6 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1838.)

A very impartial work, not brilliant, but sensible and useful.

Numismatics of the Middle Ages. By Lelewel. (French.—2 vols. Brussels, 1836.)

A very useful and learned production from a noble and unfortunate veteran of Polish science and of Polish martyrdom.

History of Modern Europe. By Russell. (London.—4 vols. 8vo. repeatedly printed.)

By no means a deep work, but pleasing and popular.

Lectures on European Civilisation. By M. Guizot. (There are six English translations.)

Literary History of the Middle Ages. By Rev. Mr. Berrington. (Reprinted by Bogue, London. 1 vol. 1846.)

History of Literature during the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries. By Henry Hallam. (London. 6 vols. 1840.)

An invaluable treasure of literary researches. The range of studies, enlarged views, and accuracy of detail, exhibited in this work, are truly astonishing.

History of the Laws on Property in the West. By Laboulaye. (French.—1 vol. 1839.)

It contains a most complete exposition of the barbarian laws.

The Jews in the Middle Ages. By Depping. (French.—1 vol. 1834.)

History of Inventions. By Beckman. (Reprinted by Bohn, London, 1848. 3 vols.)

History of Commerce between Europe and the East. By Depping. (French.—2 vols. 1830.)

History of the Abolition of Personal Servitude. By Biot. (French.—Paris, 1840. 1 vol.)

History of the Roman Law in the Middle Ages. By Savigny. (German.—6 vols. Heidelberg, 1826, &c. Excellent French translation by Guénoux, 6 vols. 1st vol. translated into English by Cathcart, 1829.)

A work of very rare merit.

Laws of Modern Europe. By Spence.

The Industrial History of Free Nations. By W. Torrens M'Cullagh. (2 vols. London, 1847.)

The Cities in the Middle Ages. By Hüllmann. (German.—4 vols. Bonn, 1826.)

Lectures on Modern History. By Dr. Arnold. (London, 1 vol. 1842.)

Dr. Arnold's works are all delightful, and characterised by a lofty impartiality.

Heroes and Hero Worship. By Thomas Carlyle. (London, 1 vol. 1843.)

An earnest and picturesque work.

On the Use and Study of History. By Torrens M'Cullagh. (Dublin, 1 vol. 1842.)

Very eloquent—full of useful suggestions, although too brief.

Manual of the History of Art. By Kugler. (German.—Stuttgart, 1 vol. 1841.)

An excellent compendium.

Wealth of Nations. By Adam Smith. (M'Culloch's edition. 1 vol. 8vo, 1840.)

Containing the most valuable and elaborate notes.

Principles of Political Economy. By J. S. Mill. (London, 2 vols. 1848.)

The English school presented in its mildest form.

Political Economy. By D. Ricardo. (M'Culloch's edition. London, 1846.)

Christian Political Economy. By Villeneuve Bargemont. (French.—2 vols. large 8vo, 1841.)

A truly Christian work, laying down CHARITY as the pre-eminent principle of Christian civilisation.

Complete Course of Practical Political Economy. By T. B. Say. (French.—Paris, 6 vols. 1830.)

Work of high merit.

History of the Saracens. By Simon Ockley. (London, 2 vols. 8vo, 1757.)

Has always been highly esteemed: it was written by the ill-fated author while in prison for debt.

History of the Crusades. By Ch. Mills. (London, 1820. 2 vols. 8vo.)

History of the Crusades. By F. Wilken. (German.—7 vols. 8vo. Leipzig, 1807—1832.)

History of the Crusades. By Michaud. (French.—7 vols. Paris, 1808.)

Essay on the Influence of the Crusades. By Heeren. (German.—French translation. Paris, 1808.)

Extracts from the Arabian Historians, referring to the Wars of the Crusades. By Reinaud. (French.—1 vol. Paris, 1829.)

Oriental Library. By Herbelot. (French.—17 vols. 1787.)

Manual of the History of Painting, from Constantine the Great to the latest Times. By Kugler. (German.—2 vols. 1839.)

Lives of Painters. By Vasari. (English translation in Bohn's Standard Library.)

A valuable production of the 16th century.

History of the Ottoman Empire. By De Flammer. (German.—Pesth, 1835, 10 vols. 8vo. French translation, by Hellert, 10 vols. Another, by Dochez, 3 vols.)

History of Moral and Political Sciences since the Sixteenth Century. By M. Matter. (French.—3 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1834.)

History of Europe since the Close of the Fifteenth Century. By Raumer. (German.—Leipsig, 6 vols. 8vo, 1832, and following.)

History of the Eighteenth Century. By Schlosser. (German.—French translation, 8 vols. 1830, Paris. English translation, published by Chapman and Hall.)

Must be read with caution, as it contains many misstatements.

History of Philosophy. By Tennemann. (German.—9 vols. 1810—1814.)

Manual of the History of Philosophy. By Tennemann. (German.—1 vol. English translation, by Johnson, Oxford, 1832. French translation, by M. Cousin.)

Contains minute chronological information concerning all the leading epochs of philosophy, and excellent brief notices of all the principal schools.

Universal History. By Cantu. (Italian.—Turin, 1838, &c. Translated into French under the superintendence of the Author, published by Didot. 19 vols. 1842—1849.)

A very complete, valuable work, forming a *resume* of all historical researches, ancient and modern.

Course of Historical Studies. By Mr. Daunou. (French.—20 vols. Paris, 1840—1848.)

Result of fifteen years of professional tuition, and analysing minutely all the ramifications of history.

Philosophy of History. By Dr. Miller. (Lectures delivered in Dublin, 1824, and reprinted in Bohn's Standard Library, London, 1848.)

A work which we reluctantly annex to our list, because its doctrine of providential interference in all human affairs becomes, as it were, an apology for every human infamy; thus, the profligacy of a Catherine II. of Russia is represented as beneficial, because the absence of sentiment ensured the non-interference of her lovers in the government; on the other hand, Dr. Miller annuls his own doctrine by not recognising the reality of Mahomet, and he speaks of him in a manner unworthy of a man of sense and learning.

History of Literature. By Eichhorn. (German.—Gott. 1805, 8 vols. 8vo.)

A most complete history of all sciences.

Manual of the History of Literature. By Wachler. (German.—4 vols. 8vo, Leips.)

History of the Eighteenth Century. By Lacretelle. (French.—4 vols. Paris, 1830.)

A very estimable and useful work.

History of the Religious Wars. By Lacretelle. (French.—4 vols. Paris, 1821.)

History of the Revolutions of Europe, from the Subversion of the Roman Empire in the West, to the Abdication of Napoleon. By C. W. Koch. (English translation, by Andrew Crichton, 1847; Whittaker's Popular Library. French, 3 vols. 8vo, 1823, Paris.)

Tableau of the Revolutions in the Political System of Europe since the Close of the Fifteenth Century. By M. Ancillon. (French.—4 vols. 8vo. Berlin, 1806. Paris, 1823.)

The Church.

Ecclesiastical Monuments of the Six First Centuries. By Le Nain de Tillemont. (16 vols. 4to, constantly quoted by Gibbon, who speaks in admiration of its accuracy.)

Ecclesiastical History. By Fleury and S. Fabre. (Paris, 37 vols. new edition in 1838.)

Only goes to the close of the Council of Trent. The best existing history on that subject.

Manners of the Catholics (*Mores Catholici*). By Mr. K. Digby. (7 vols. 12mo, now under republication.)

A mine of ecclesiastical and general learning on the middle ages.

History of the Religion of the Reformed Churches. By Basnage. (A French Protestant work. Rott. 1 vol. 12mo, 1690.)

Library of Ecclesiastical Authors; with Supplement. By Ell. Dupin. (French.—61 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1698, and following.)

Annals of the Order of St. Benedict. By D. Mabillon. (Latin.—6 vols. fol. Paris, 1703.)

Rights of the Empire over the Ecclesiastical State. By Muratori. (French.—4 vols. 4to, Utrecht, 1713.)

A work of controversy.

On the Origin of the Pontifical Domination. (Italian.—Rome, 1 vol. 1754.)

Also a work of controversy.

General Collection of the Councils. By Hardouin, Labbe, and Mansi. (French.—Florence and Venice, 31 vols. fol. 1759, and following.)

The last is considered the best.

Ecclesiastical Annals. By Cæsar Baronius; with Criticisms and Historical Supplements of Pagi, Raynaldus, &c. (Luc. 1738, 1759, 38 vols. fol.)

Work almost entirely composed from original texts and documents, and containing abundance of papers not found elsewhere. The work is Roman Catholic, and has been criticised by the Protestants, Casauon and Basnage.

Histories of the Councils of Pisa and Constance. By Lenfant. (French.—Amsterdam, 4 vols. 1727.)

History of Manicheus and of Manicheism. By Beausobre. (French.—Amsterdam, 2 vols. 1734.)

History of the Monastic Orders. By Helyot. (French.—Paris, 8 vols. 1714.)

Institutes of Ecclesiastical History. By Mosheim. (Latin.—Helmst. 1755. A new Literal English Translation, by Murdock, edited, with Notes, by Soames. 4 vols. 8vo. 1845.)
A Protestant work.

Manual of Ecclesiastical History. By Gieseler. (German.—2 vols. Bonn, 1831. Translated by F. Cunningham, 3 vols. Philadelphia, 1836.)

A work invaluable, owing to the numerous controverted texts, and variety of documents.

History of the Constitution of the Christian Church. By Plank. (German.—6 vols. 1804, and following.)

A Protestant work, but truly impartial.

The History of Catholics of Great Britain. By Charles Butler. (London, 4 vols. 8vo, 1822.)

An excellent work.

General History of the Christian Religion and of the Church. By Dr. Neander. (German.—5 vols. 1827. English translation, by Joseph Torrey, 3 vols. 1847.)

History of Gnosticism. By Matter. (French.—2 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1828.)

History of the Church, from the earliest Ages to the Reformation. By Rev. G. Waddington. (London, 1833.)

History of Christianity. By Rev. H. Milman. (London, 6 vols. 1835.)

A work characterised by an enlightened toleration, blended with profound learning, and a true Christian spirit.

History of the Destruction of Paganism in the West. By Beugnot. (French.—Paris, 2 vols. 1835.)

History of Gregory VII. and of his Age. By J. Voigt. (German.—2 vols. 8vo. French translation, by Abbé Jager, 1838.)

One of the ablest biographies of our age.

History of Innocent III. By Hurter. (German.—2 vols. 1836. French translation, 1838.)

History of Germany during the Reformation. By Ranke. (German.—3 vols. 8vo, Berlin, 1839.)

History of the Popes during the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries. By Ranke. (German.—4 vols. Berlin, 1838. There are two English translations of this celebrated work, one by Mrs. Austin, the other by Mr. Kelly.)

History of the Life and Works of Luther. By Audin. (French.—2 vols. 8vo, 1838, Paris.)

Elegantly written, and evincing great original researches, but sadly impaired by the most ardent hostility and prejudice against the Reformed Churches.

History of the Life and Works of Calvin. By Audin. (French.—2 vols. Paris, 1841.)

Presents the same characteristics as the above work.

History of the Reformation in the Sixteenth Century. By Merle d'Aubigné. (French.—1840. Several English translations.)

A work ably written, but full of the most flagrant misstatements, often the result of a blind Protestant fanaticism.

Reformers before the Reformation. By Emile Bonnechose. (French.—2 vols. Paris, 1841. English translation, by Mackenzie, of Trinity College, Dublin, 2 vols. 1849.)

Letters of John Huss. By Emile Bonnechose. (French.—1 vol., &c. English translation, by M. Mackenzie, Dublin, 1 vol. 1849.)

Most interesting documents.

Great Britain.

Alliances and Treaties between English Kings and other Sovereigns. By Rymer and Sanderson. (Latin.—London, 20 vols. fol. 1066—1654; last edit. 1816. The Hague edition, 10 vols. folio, contains a translation of the documents.)

A most valuable collection.

The English, Scottish, and Irish Historical Library. By Nicholson. (London, 1776. 4to.)

The Statutes of the Realm. (London, 11 vols. fol., forming part of the great Collection published since 1810, under the auspices of the English Government, on Feudalism and the History of England.)

History of the Civil Wars, and of the Rebellion, in England. By Lord Clarendon. (4 vols. 1641—1660.)

In the latter editions of that well known history the suppressed pages are re-produced.

History of the Reformation of the Church of England. By Burnet. (3 vols. 1679.)

Essay towards a General History of Feudal Property in Great Britain. By Sir J. Dalrymple. (London, 8vo. 1758.)

Memoirs of Ludlow, Whitelock, &c., referring to the Revolution of 1648.

Antiquities of England, Ireland, and Scotland. By Grose. (10 vols. fol. 1773.)

A highly valued work.

History of the British Empire, 1625—1660. By Brodie. (4 vols. 1827.)

The first history that revealed the fallacies of Hume.

History of Alfred the Great. By Lorentz. (German.—1 vol. 1828.)

Memoirs of the Duke of Marlborough. By Coxe. (Reprinted in Bohn's Standard Library, 1849.)

History of the English Revolution of 1648. By M. Guizot. (French.—2 vols. 1824. Two English translations.)

Perhaps the best production of that celebrated historian, orator, and statesman.

History of the English Revolution of 1688. By Mazare. (French.—3 vols. 1825. Two English translations.)

History of the Counter-Revolution in England. By Armand Carrel. (French.—2 vols. 1824. Translated in Bogue's European Library, London, 1 vol. 1847.)

History of the Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth. By Sir F. Palgrave. (London, 2 vols. 1832.)

Constitutional History of England. By H. Hallam. (London, 3 vols. 1825.)

Enquiry into the Rise and Progress of the Royal Prerogative. By Mr. Allen. (London, 8vo. 1830.)

Admirable political investigation.

Lives of Eminent Statesmen of the Commonwealth. By J. Forster. (London, 5 vols. 1833. Lardner's Cyclopædia.)

History of the Conquest of England by the Normans. By Augustin Thierry. (French.—New edition. 3 vols. 1836. Several English translations.)

Justly celebrated for all the merits that constitute a great and lasting work.

Memorials of the Great Civil War in England, 1646—1652. By Cary. (London, 2 vols. 8vo. 1842.)

Pictorial History of England. By Charles M'Farlane and G. L. Craik. London, 1840, and following. 8 vols. imp. 8vo.)

A truly encyclopædic history.

History of England. By Dr. Lingard. (10 vols. New edition, 1849.)

A most learned history, by a distinguished member of the Church of Rome.

Essays on the Literature and Popular Superstitions of England in the Middle Ages. By Thomas Wright. (London, 2 vols. 1846.)

Political Songs of England. By Thomas Wright. (1 vol. 1840.)

Political Ballads during the Commonwealth. By Thomas Wright. (1 vol. 1841.)

British Biography, Anglo-Saxon, and Anglo-Norman Period.
By Thomas Wright. (London, 2 vols. 1846.)

Lives of the Queens of England. By Agnes Strickland. (12 vols. London, 1840, &c. &c.)

Lives of the Chancellors of England. By Lord Campbell. (6 vols. 1846, and following.)

Letters and Speeches of Cromwell. By Thomas Carlyle. (London, 4 vols. 1845.)

History of England under the House of Hanover. By Thomas Wright.

History of England from the Peace of Utrecht to that of Aix-la-Chapelle. By Lord Mahon. (London, 4 vols. 1844.)

Life of Thomas à Becket. By Dr. Giles. (London, 2 vols. 1842.)

Progress of the Nation. By G. R. Porter. (London, 4 vols. 1838.)

New Commentaries on the Laws of England. By Henry John Stephen.—(4 vols. 1848.)

One of the most valuable productions of our time. Must be studied by all desirous to understand the English constitution.

History of Henry VIII. and of the English Schism. By Audin. (French.—2 vols. 1847.)

Also evincing great original researches, but disgraced by great bitterness on that religious subject.

The Saxons in England; History of the English Commonwealth until the Norman Conquest. By John M. Kemble. (London, 2 vols. 1848.)

The best work, we believe, on the Anglo-Saxon period.

History of England from the Accession of James II. By T. B. Macaulay. (London, 2 vols. 1849. Unfinished.)

One of the most admirable histories of our age.

Rushworth, Abridged, 6 vols. 8vo, 1703.

Whitelock's Memoirs, 1732.

Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, 4to, 1806.

History of Parliament. By May. 4to, 1812.

History of his own Times. By Burnet. 2 vols. fol.

History of Scotland. By Sir Walter Scott. (London, 1832. Lardner's Cyclopædia.)

History of Scotland, By Patrick Fraser Tytler. (London, Edinburgh, 10 vols. 1846.)

The most complete work on that interesting country.

Collection of the Letters of Mary Stuart. By Prince Labanoff. (French.—6 vols. 8vo, 1839.)

History of Ireland. By Leland. (London and Dublin, 3 vols. 1773.)

A Protestant work, but excellent.

History of Ireland. By Thomas Moore. (London, 1833. Lardner's Cyclopædia.)

This work did not answer the public expectation.

History of Ireland. By Abbé Mac Géoghégan.—(French.—Translated into English by Patrick O'Kelly, Dublin. 1 vol. 8vo. 1844.)

History of Ireland. By Thomas Wright. (London, 2 vols. 1848.)

The Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. By Rev. Dr. Lenigan. (4 vols.)

Life of James Duke of Ormond. By Th. Carte. (3 vols. fol. 1735-36.)

The best repository of Irish documents during the seventeenth century.

Work on Ireland. By Sir James Ware. (2 vols. fol. 1761.)

Indispensable for the knowledge of Irish history. A good history of Ireland is still a desideratum.

Review of the Civil Wars of Ireland. By Dr. Currie.

France.

Literary History of France. By the Benedictines. (French.—20 vols. 4to. 1733, and following.)

Historical Library of France. By Lelong. (French.—5 vols. fol. 1768.)

A bibliographical work.

Ordinances of the Kings of France. By De Lauriere, &c. (1723. and following. 20 vols. fol., Paris.)

General Collection of the French Laws (1789). By Isambert and others. (French.—30 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1822.)

Memoirs relating to the History of France till the Thirteenth Century. Published under the direction of M. Guizot. (French.—26 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1823.)

Collection of Unpublished Documents on the History of France. Published by Order of the Government since 1836. (Paris. 4 or 5 volumes appear every year.)

Collection of the National Chronicles of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. By M. Buchon. (Paris, 30 vols. 8vo, 1826.)

New Collection of Memoirs relating to the History of France. By Michaud and Poujoulet. (French.—25 vols. 8vo, 1836.)

Curious Archives of the History of France. Published by Cimber and Danjou. (French.—27 vols. 8vo, 1834, and following.)

Collection of the best Dissertations on the History of France.
By Leber, Salgues, and Cohen. (Paris, 29 vols. 8vo, 1826.)

Civil Wars of France. By Davila. (Italian.—Reprinted in
London, 6 vols. 1801.)

History of his own Times, 1546—1607, by Thuanus (de Thou).
(Latin.—London, 7 vols. fol. 1733.)

Critical History of the Establishment of the French Monarchy in
Gaul. By Abbé Dubois. (French.—3 vols. Amsterdam,
1735; or, Paris, 2 vols. 4to, 1742.)

History of the Establishment of the French in Gaul. By Presi-
dent Hénault. (French.—2 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1801.)

Theory of the Political Laws of Gaul and France. By Mademoi-
selle de la Lezardiére. (French.—8 vols. Paris, 1791.)

Highly valued by all the great historians of the age.

History of Charlemagne. By Gaillard. (French.—2 vols.
Paris, 1819.)

History of the Maritime Expeditions of the Normans. By Dep-
ping. (French.—1 vol. Paris, 1826.)

Invasion of the Sarrazins in the South of France. By Raynaud.
(French.—1 vol. Paris, 1836.)

History of the Gauls. By Amédée Thierry. (French.—3 vols.
8vo, 2nd edition, Paris, 1834.)

Letters on the History of France. By Augustin Thierry.
(French.—1 vol. Paris, 1829.)

The first work in the new great era of French historians.

History of Saint-Louis. By Villeneuve Trans. (French.—
3 vols. 1839.)

History of the Franks. By Moke. (French.—1 vol. Paris,
1835.)

History of Southern Gaul under the Domination of the Ger-
mans. By Fauriel. (French.—4 vols. 1836.)

History of Civilisation in Europe and France. By M. Guizot.
(5 vols. New edition. Paris, 1840.)

Narratives from the Merovingian Era. By Augustin Thierry.
(French.—2 vols. 1840. English translation in Whittaker's
Popular Library.)

Epitome of the History of French Laws. By Pomelet. (French.
1 vol. Paris, 1838.)

A very useful compendium.

Lectures on French Literature. By M. Villemain. (French.—
6 vols. New edition. Paris, 1848.)

Very eloquent and comprehensive, with the exception, however, of
the Germanic origins.

Literary History of France before the Twelfth Century. By J. J. Amperè. (French.—3 vols. Paris, 1838.)

An invaluable philological history of the formation of the French language.

History of the French of different Trades. By Alexis Monteil. (French.—10 vols. New edition. Paris, 1848.)

An invaluable collection of minute facts from the antiquarian stores of past times, tracing their relation to the most important events. Result of twenty years of laborious perseverance and indefatigable industry.

History of the Regency of the Duke of Orléans. By Lemontery. (French.—2 vols. 8vo, 1832.)

History of the Merovingian and Carolingian Institutions. By Lehueron. (French.—2 vols. Paris, 1843-4.)

A most valuable and lucid contribution to an eventful period of the history of France.

Democracy among the Preachers of the League. By Charles Lafite. (French.—1 vol. Paris, 1841.)

Collection of fragments establishing the democratical tendencies of the celebrated league.

History of the Dukes of Burgundy. By M. De Barante. (French.—12 vols. New edition. 1842.)

Elegant compilation from the chronicles of the fifteenth century, and pretty much in their simple but graphic style.

History of the War of Succession. By Lord Mahon. (London, 1 vol. 1838.)

History of Louis XIII. By Bazin. (French.—3 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1839.)

Excellent, complete history of that period.

Memoirs of the Duke of St. Simon. (French.—20 vols. Paris, 1831.)

Most acute in their observations; revealing many of the turpitudes of the French court.

Memoirs of Cardinal de Retz.

Reckoned among the first of such compositions.

Historical Researches on Cardinal de Retz. By Musset Pathay. (French.—1 vol. 8vo, Paris, 1807.)

History of the Wars of the Fronde. By Count St. Aulaire. (French.—Paris, 3 vols. 1827.)

Estimable work, which, however, has lost much of its importance since the discovery of new documents by subsequent historians.

Richelieu, Mazarin, la Fronde. By Capetique. (French.—8 vols. Paris, 1835.)

M. C. is a most prolific compiler. His works amount to about eighty volumes. He sometimes compiles from new sources as in this work, and a few others, but generally he does so with a culpable negligence and extravagance.

History of the Reign of Louis XIV. By Capéfigue. (French.—6 vols. Paris, 1838.)

A work, at times, fascinating, but the views of this writer, in all matters relative to religious and political freedom, are truly contemptible. He is the apologist of the middle ages, and of every despotism.

History of the French. By Sismondi. (French.—29 vols. Terminated in 1843.)

A complete history in a democratical spirit, displaying vast learning. The work is praised by M. Guizot in his French Civilisation, and by Mr. Hallam.

History of France. By Michelet. (French.—6 vols. 1840, &c., unfinished. English translation, by G. H. Smith.)

Most picturesque and sparkling, with new and brilliant analogies, but does not form a consecutive history of France.

History of the French. By Lavallée. (Paris, 4 vols. 1838.)

Almost an abridgment of Sismondi's great work.

General History of Languedoc. By Dom Vaissette. (French.—A work of 1730, but reprinted in Paris, 1840. 5 vols. fol.)

History of Brittany. By Daru. (French.—8 vols. Paris, 1821.)

History of Lorraine. By Dom Calmet. (French.—Nancy, 7 vols. 1745; also reprinted.)

Alsatia, Illustrated. (Latin.—Colmar, 2 vols. fol. 1751.)

History of Paris. By Dulaure. (Paris, 12 vols. 1828, and following.)

Parliamentary History of the French Revolution. By Buchez et Roux. (French.—40 vols. Paris, 1833, and following.)

History of France from 1789. By Montgaillard. (French.—12 vols. 1817—1825.)

History of France. By Henry Martin. (Paris, 12 vols. 1842. The new edition of 1846 is considerably enlarged and improved.)

This history is considered by many as the most complete

History of the French Revolution. By A. Thiers. (French.—19 vols. Several editions and English translations.)

The work of a young and ardent man, whose views have since much altered.

History of the French Revolution. By M. Mignet. (French.—2 vols. 1827. Has had also many editions and English translations.)

A masterly sketch.

History of the French Revolution. By Louis Blanc. (French.—2 vols. 1846. To be completed in ten.)

Remarkable for the elegance and purity of style, as well as for its profound historical investigations, totally unconnected with the author's social theories and political adventures in our time.

History of the Arts in France. By Alex. Lenois. (French.—4to and Atlas folio, Paris, 1810. Also the Museum of French Monuments, by the same, 8 vols. in 8vo, 1800; and the Atlas of the Monuments of Arts in France till Francis I. Paris, fol. 1828.)

Germany.

Archives of the Germanic Empire. By Lünig. (German.—24 vols. fol. Leipsig, 1710.)

Collection of the Imperial Constitutions. Goldasti. (Latin.—Francfort, 1713, 2 vols. fol.)

Collection of the Writers on Germanic Affairs and History. By Schard. (Gren., 1673, 4 vols. fol.—Pistorius and Struve, Ratisb. 1726, 3 vols. fol.—Reuber and Joannes, Francf., 1729, 1 vol. fol.—Urstitius, Francf., 1670, 2 vols. fol.—Freher and Struve, Argent., 1717, 8 vols. fol.—Lindenbrog (Writers on the History of the Northern Nations), Meibom, Helmst., 1688, 3 vols. fol.—Leibnitz (Hann.), Hann., 1700, fol.—(Brunsw.), 1707, 3 vols. fol.—Pertz, Monuments of the History of Germany, 6 vols., not completed, Hann., 1826, and following.)

Chronological Abridgment of the History and Public Law of Germany. By Pfeffel. (German.—2 vols. 4to, 1776.)

History of the Constitution of Germany. By Eichhorn. (German.—Gœtt., 4 vols. 1821.)

History of the German States. By Hüllmann. (German.—Francf., 3 vols. 1806.)

History of Germany. By Pfister. (German.—12 vols. 1828. French translation, by Paquis, 11 vols. Paris, 1838.)

A learned but very heavy work.

History of Germany. By Luden. (German.—Several editions. French translation, by Savagner, 3 very thick 8vo vols. 1840.)

History of Germany. By Wolfgang Menzel. (German.—English translation in Bohn's Standard Library. 3 vols. 1848.)

The most picturesque History of Germany.

History of the Germanic Empire. By Dr. Dunham. (London. Lardner's Cyclopædia, 3 vols. 1837.)

Less a history of Germany than a history of the church, learning, and political state of the Germanic empire.

History of the Netherlands. By Grattan. (London. Lardner's Cyclopædia.)

History of the Hans League. By Sartorius. (German.—3 vols. 1802-3.)

History of Charles V. By Robertson. (New edition. London, 1818, 4 vols.)

A work of the old school, but may yet be read with some fruit.

History of the 'Thirty Years' War. By Schiller. (German.—Several English translations.)

History of the Peace of Westphalia. By Woltman. (German.—2 vols. 1808. Several English translations.)

History of the House of Austria, from 1218 to 1792. By Coxe. (London. New edition in Bohn's Library. 3 vols. 1848.)

History of the Hohenstauffens. By Raumer. (German.—Leips. 6 vols. 1822.)

The best work of this distinguished historian.

Historical Works of Frederick the Great. (French.—Leip. 1831.)

History of the Life of Frederick the Great, of Prussia. By Preuss. (German.—2 vols. 1834.)

History of the Seven Years' War. By Archenholz. (German.—2 vols. 1793.)

On Prussian Monarchy under Frederick the Great. By Mirabeau. (French.—9 vols. London, 1788.)

History of Frederick the Great. By Paganel. (French.—2 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1830.)

History of the Netherlands. By Wicquefort. (French.—Hague, 2 vols.)

History of the War of Independence in the Netherlands. By Watson. (Several recent editions.)

History of the War of the Netherlands. By Schiller. (German.—Translated in Bohn's Standard Library.)

History of Holland. By Mrs. Davies. (London, 3 large 8vo vols., 1841.)

History of Joseph II. By Paganel. (French.—1 vol. Paris, 1845.)

Life of Wallenstein. By Colonel Mitchell. (London, 1 vol. 1846.)

History of Prussia. By Ranke. (German.—Translated into English by Sir Alex. and Lady Duff Gordon. 3 vols. 1849.)

History of the National Literature of the Germans. By Gerwinus. (Leipzig, 5 vols. 1846. 3rd edit.)

Encyclopædia of the National Literature of Germany. By Dr. O. T. B. Wolff. (German.—8 vols. large 8vo, close print. Leipzig, 1847.)

. German literature is extremely rich in special histories of the smaller States of the Confederation, many of which, such as the History of Osnabruck, of Moser; the History of Pomerania, by Barthold; the History of Bohemia, by Palacky, are highly important, on account of the new and unpublished documents they contain.

Italy.

Annals of Italy. By Muratori. (Italian.—Milan, 6 vols. fol. 1738. Other edition, 10 vols. 4to, 1744.)

History of Western Italy. By C. Denina. (Italian.—Turin, 6 vols. 8vo, 1809.)

History of the Republic of Genoa. By De Mailly. (French.—3 vols. 12mo, Paris, 1697.)

Revolutions of Italy. By C. Denina. (Italian.—Turin, 3 vols. 4to, 1769.)

History of Florence, &c. By Machiavelli. (Italian.—1532. English translation in Bohn's Standard Library.)

Histories of the Brothers Villani. (Italian.—3 vols. 4to, Florence, 1577—1587; and Venice, 1562.)

History of Italy. By Guicciardini, 1493—1532. (Italian.—1540. Translated into English, French, and German. Continued to 1789 by Botta. 10 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1832.)

History of the Republic of Venice. By Daru. (French.—7 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1819.)

Presents a mass of original documents.

Florence and her Vicissitudes. By Delecluze. (French.—2 vols. Paris, 1837.)

A charming work, blending a facile elegance of style with a real erudition.

History of the Italian Republics. By Sismondi. (French.—New edition. 10 vols. 1846.)

Written with a glowing and vivid pencil, full of the ardour of youth, and of a pure love for liberty.

History of Italy. By Leo. (German.—8 vols. French translation, by Dochez, 3 vols. thick 8vo, Paris, 1838.)

Essay on the Civil and Political Government of the Nations of Italy under the Government of the Goths. By G. Sartorius. (French.—Paris, 1811.)

History of Italian Literature. By Tiraboschi. (Italian.—New edition. Florence, 9 vols. 1805-13.)

Literary History of Italy. By Ginguené. (French.—10 vols. Paris, 1811.)

The best modern work on the subject.

History of the Literature of the South of Europe. By Sismondi. (French.—Translated by Roscoe. Bohn's Standard Library.)

History of the Conquest of Naples by Charles of Anjou. By Alexis de St. Priest. (French.—2 vols. Paris, 1848.)

An attractive and valuable work.

- Life of Leo X. By Roscoe. (Reprinted in Bogue's European Library, 1847.)
- Life of Lorenzo de Medici. By Roscoe. (In Bogue's Library, 1 vol. 1847.)
- Sketches of Venetian History. (London, 2 vols. Family Library, 1832.)
- History of Italy of the Middle Ages. By Troya. (Italian.—5 vols. Naples, 1839—1841.)
- History of Sicily under the Domination of the Normans. By Bazancourt. (French.—2 vols. Paris, 1847.)
- Florentine History. By Captain Henry Napier. (London, 6 vols. 1848.)

. Each of the Italian States possesses many excellent special histories, Naples especially, most of which have never been translated, and are not much known out of Italy. See Brunet's *Manuel du Libraire, nouvelle édition*, 1844.

Spain and Portugal.

- Ancient Spanish Library, comprising the Writers who flourished from the Reign of the Emperor Augustus to the Year 1500. By Nic. Antonio. (Latin.—Rome, 1696, and Madrid, 1783. 2 vols. fol.)
- Modern Spanish Library, from 1500 to 1682. By the same. (Continuation of the other, though published before it, at Rome, 1672. The last edition is that of Madrid, 1788, 2 vols. fol.)
- Both works indispensable to the literary history of Spain, being among the best of their kind.
- History of Spain, by Mariana, with Continuation. (The Work in classical Latin, as well as in pure Spanish. New edition. 4 vols. 4to, Valen., 1783.)
- Mariana died in 1624. He is considered as one of the great fathers of history, but his work has nevertheless been found to contain many fables.
- Historical and Chronological Synopsis of Spain. By Juan de Ferreras. (Spanish.—French translation, by d'Hermilly. 10 vols. 4to, Paris, 1741.)
- History of the Mohammedan Empire in Spain. By Murphy. (London, 1 vol. 4to, 1816.)
- An excellent work.
- History of Spain. By M. M. Busk. (London, 1 vol. 1832. Library of Useful Knowledge.)
- History of Spain. By Dunham. (London, 2 vols. 1835. Lardner's Cyclopædia.)

Memoirs of the Kings of Spain of the House of Bourbon. By Coxe. (London, 5 vols. 1815.)

The Osmanlis and Spain in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. By Ranke. (German.—1 vol. 8vo, 1835. French translation, with Notes, by M. Haiber, Paris, 1839.)

Negotiations relating to the Succession of Spain. Published by M. Mignet. (French.—1 vol. 8vo, 1835.)

History of Spanish Literature. By Bouterweck. (German.—2 vols. 1812. English translation in Bogue's European Library.)

A useful book, but considered as very imperfect by the Spanish literati.

History of the Arabs and of the Moors in Spain. By Louis Viardot. (French.—2 vols. 1839.)

History of the Domination of the Arabs in Spain. By Don José Antonio Conde. (Spanish.—Madrid, 3 vols. 4to, 1820. Has been translated into English, French, and German.)

History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. By W. Prescott. (London, 3 vols. Fifth edition, 1850.)

History of the Conquest of Mexico. By W. Prescott. (London, 3 vols. Fifth edition, 1850.)

History of the Conquest of Peru. By Prescott. (London, 2 vols. New edition. 1850.)

All Mr. Prescott's works are invaluable.

History of Columbus. By Washington Irving. (London, 3 vols. 1833.)

History of Spain. By St. Hilaire. (French.—6 vols. 8vo, 1836, and following. Not finished.)

History of Spain. By Charles Romey. (French.—10 vols. 8vo, 1838, &c.)

The most complete.

History of Don Pedro, of Castille. By Mérimée. (French.—1 vol. 1848. English translation, London, 1849.)

A delightful work.

History of Spanish Literature. By George Ticknor. (London, Murray, 3 vols. 1850.)

General History of Portugal. [By A. de Lemos de Faria e Castro. (Portuguese.—17 vols. 8vo, Lisbon, 1786, &c.)

Historical, Critical, and Chronological Portuguese Library. By Diago Barboro Marchado. (Portuguese.—4 vols. fol. Lisbon, 1704.)

Historical Library of Portugal. By José Carlo Pinto de Sousa. (Portuguese.—Lisbon, 1 vol. 4to, 1801.)

- General History of Portugal. By Requier de la Neufville. (French.—Paris, 2 vols. 4to, 1700.)
- Administration of D. S. T. Carvalho, Marquis of Pombal. (French. 4 vols. 4to, 1789, Amsterdam and Paris.)
- History of Philip II. of Spain. By Watson. (London, 2 vols. in 4to, 1778.) And of Philip III., 1786, left unfinished, but continued by Thompson.
- History of Portugal. By Schäfer. (German.—2 vols. 1836—1839.)
- Memoirs of Spain during the reign of Philip IV. and Charles II. from 1621 to 1700. By T. Dunlop. (2 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh, 1834.)
- Essay on the History of Portugal. By Chaumeil de Stella and Auguste de Santeul. (French.—2 vols. Brussels, 1811.)

Scandinavia.

- History of Norway. By Torfaei. (Latin.—4 vols. fol. Haf. 1711.)
- History of Denmark. By Mallet. (French.—4 vols. 8vo, Geneva, 1763.)
- Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. By Dunham. (London, 3 vols. Lardner's Cyclopædia, 1833.)
- General History of Denmark and Norway. By Gebhardi. (German.—2 vols. 1768.)
- History of Sweden. By E. G. Geijer. (Swedish.—English translation, by J. H. Turner. 3 parts, 1848.)
The only great history of Sweden.
- Scandinavia, Ancient and Modern. By Crichton and Wheaton. (Edinburgh, 2 vols. 1838.)
Most comprehensive and useful.
- Northern Antiquities. By Mallet. (London, reprinted in Bohn's Standard Library, 1848.)
- History of Gustavus Adolphus. By Fryxell. (Swedish.—French translation, by R. Du Puget. Paris, 1846.)
- History of Denmark. By Dahlmann. (German.—New edition. 1 vol. 8vo, Hamb. 1840.)
The best history of that country.
- History of Charles XII. By Voltaire.
An agreeable book, but without much historical value.
- Military History of Charles XII. By Adlerfeld. (French.—4 vols. 1740.)
Originally in Swedish; the French translation is by the son of the author.

History of Charles XII. By L. H. Lundblad. (Swedish.—German translation, by Von Tenssen. 2 vols. 8vo, 1835.)

History of Gustavus Vasa. By Archenholtz. (German.—French translation, by Propiac. 2 vols. 1803.)

History of Gustavus Adolphus. By Mauvillon. (French.—1 vol. in 4to, Amsterdam, 1764.)

Work composed from the manuscripts of Mr. Archenholtz.

Memoirs on Christina, of Sweden, collected by Archenholtz. (French.—Amsterdam, 4 vols. 1751.)

History of Gustavus Adolphus. By W. Harte. (London, 2 vols. 1759.)

The Swedes since Charles XII. By Beaumont Vassy. (French.—2 vols. 8vo, 1841.)

History of the Literature of Sweden and Denmark. By X. Marmier. (French.—1 vol. 1840.)

Russia.

Russian Annals of Nestor, from 858 to the Middle of the Sixteenth Century. (French translation. 2 vols. Paris, 1838.)

History of the Russian Empire. By Karamsin. (French translation from the Russian, by Jauffret and de Divoff. 11 vols. Paris, 1845.)

The only great Russian history, of which the Russians are justly so proud.

History of Russia. By Levesque. (French.—New edition, with Notes. 8 vols. 8vo, 1812.)

Work drawn from the original chronicles.

History of Russia. By Leclerc. (French.—6 vols. 4to, Paris, 1783.)

History of Russia. By Esneaux and Chennechet. (French.—5 vols. 8vo, 1829—1839.)

History of Russia. By Robert Bell. (London, Longman, 1839.)

Revolutions of the Nations of the North. By Chopin. (French.—4 vols. Paris, 1841.)

A most valuable and interesting work.

History of the Russian States. By Strahl. (German.—2 vols. 1839.)

Poland.

General History of Poland. By de Salignac. (French.—5 vols. 12mo, Amsterdam, 1751.)

History of the Anarchy of Poland. By Ruhlière. (French.—5 vols. New edition. 1820.)

M. De St. Priest, in a late criticism, strips this work of nearly all merit.

- History of Poland under Sobieski. By Salvandy. (French.—3 vols. 8vo, 1830.)
- History of Poland. By Dunham. (London, 1834. Lardner's Cyclopædia.)
- Tableau of Poland, Ancient and Modern. By Maltebrun. (New edition, by L. Chodzko. French.—2 vols. Paris, 1830.)
- History of Poland. By Röpell. (German.—1 vol. 1840.)
- Slavonian Antiquities. By Paul Joseph Schafariks. (German translation, by M. Von. Aehrenfeld. Leipzig, 2 vols. 8vo, 1843.)

Hungary.

- Body of Hungarian Laws. (Latin.—2 vols. fol. Tyrn., 1751.)
- History of the Revolutions of Hungary. (French.—Hague, 1739, 2 vols. 4to.)
- History of the Hungarian Empire. By Engel. (German.—5 vols. 8vo, 1814.)
- History of Hungary. By Fessler. (German.—Leipzig, 10 vols. 1815.)
- History of the Magyars. By Mailath. (German.—5 vols. 1828—1831.)
- History of Hungary. By Ghebarli. (4 vols. 8vo. 1778.)

Switzerland.

- Bibliography of the History of Switzerland. By Haller. (German.—1 vol. Bern., 1785.)
- History of Switzerland. By John Von Müller. (German.—10 vols. French translation, by Monnard and Vulliemin.)
A most complete, learned, and delightful work.
- History of Switzerland. In Lardner's Cyclopædia.
- History of Switzerland. Compiled and published by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge.
- History of Switzerland. By H. Zschokke. (German.—1 vol. French translation, by M. Monnard, formerly of Lausanne.)
A most graphic little work.

LONDON:

RICHARD KINDELL, PRINTER, GREEN ABBEY COURT
OLD BAILEY.

Date Due

0 31 '46



Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01014 2232